DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 174 HE 008 837

AUTHOR	Baker, Merl
TITLE	Multicampus and Consolidated University Systems: Administrative Structures and Governance.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Rolla.
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	248p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Campuses; *Centralization; *Governance; *Governing Boards; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *State Universities; Statistical Analysis; Surveys; Trend Analysis; *University Administration; University Extension
IDENTIFIERS	*Multicampus Universities

ABSTRACT

An objective evaluation of multicampus and consolidated university systems is presented as a composite of a literature study, a statistical survey, and results from visits to central offices and campuses. Responses from 255 executives of selected institutions were statistically analyzed regarding administrators' opinions on how their systems or campuses actually functioned and what they considered the desired degree of centralization for each of 24 areas of administration specified on the questionnaire. This report portrays the functional areas to be served by the administrative structure, whether a specific duty is executed by a single officer or shared by two or more. Focus is on the most successful structural elements of multicampus administration, with suggestions offered for effective restructuring of multicampus systems. Evidence suggests that many universities existing as multicampus systems in 1970 will move to consolidating systems of one board and one executive for the entire state. However, many independent institutions will be clustered into multicampus systems so that the net effect will be an increase in both types of systems. (LBH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED138174

MULTICAMPUS AND CONSOLIDATED UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES and GOVERNANCE

A report sponsored by the University of Missouri
July 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 008 837

Merl Baker, PhD
Special Assistant to the President, University of Missouri and
Chancellor, University of Missouri-Rolla, 1963-1973

MEMORANDUM

TO: Participating Institutions

FROM: Merl Baker

DATE: July, 1974

The attached report is based on a literature study, the December 1973 survey and my 1974 visits. Appendixes E, F and G are case reports of central office and campus visits; these are bound separately.

This paper is organized in a format that is believed to meet best the immediate needs of the University of Missouri. A perusal of the table of contents should enable others to ascertain if a topic is covered that is germane to their interest. The preface, section summaries and Section VI provide specific coverage that seems adequate except for those interested in substantiating materials. This study would not have been possible except through the full cooperation of the participating institutions and for this I am most grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed first to President C. Brice Ratchford and the University of Missouri for approval to undertake this most challenging project. The opportunity to observe eighteen systems and interview about two hundred and fifty people was an invaluable experience and I am especially grateful for the time granted for interviews by so many busy executives and to all the respondents to the survey. These two components added immeasurably to the study.

The professional assistance of colleagues has been most helpful. Dr. Lynn Martin offered excellent suggestions on the format of the survey form, especially the scale increments. Dr. John Hamblen and the staff of the Computer Science Department at the University of Missouri-Rolla made invaluable contributions to the statistical section for which I am most grateful. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mr. John Koenig of the University of Missouri-Rolla for his conscientious editing of the appendixes.

The excellent travel arrangements, typing and perseverance of my able secretary, Mrs. William J. Holcomb, are most sincerely appreciated. I would also like to thank my family for their assistance, cooperation and understanding during the eight months of this project. The study has been made even more interesting by the efforts and contributions of all of these people.

PREFACE

In 1971 the President and Board of Curators of the University of Missouri developed an "Agenda for Action" calling for an evaluation of nearly every facet of the University. In the fall of 1973 I was asked to undertake an extensive study of the structures and functions of other universities in order to provide background information for consideration in some of the long-range plans. An objective evaluation of multicampus and consolidated university systems is presented as a composite of a literature study, a statistical survey and results from visits to central offices and campuses.

After a survey of previous studies in this area, correspondence was sent to campus and system executives of selected institutions stating the goals of the study and soliciting their cooperation. Each executive was invited to request the opinions of others, in addition to expressing his own views, on how his system or campus actually functioned and what he considered the desired degree of centralization for each of the twenty-four areas of administration delineated on the form, Appendix B. Two hundred and fifty-five responses were received, studied individually and statistically analyzed from computer tabulations.

An integral part of this study was a survey of the relevant literature. Although some material was written in the sixties, most sources were from the seventies and these reflect the increase in the number of multicampus and consolidated systems in the last ten to twelve years. The development of the newer ones was especially significant for this study.

This report is designed as a reference document and when an important observation or fact transcends different topics of the structure, it may be repeated rather than referring to an earlier statement.

Organizational charts change rapidly and visits revealed that the same title may convey greatly varying responsibilities in different systems, therefore, the use of titles is avoided in this paper by substituting position descriptions. These differences were even greater than had been anticipated when the survey was designed; this precluded some planned statistical analyses.

Visits were begun in January 1974 with the usual pattern being one day at the central office, one day at the flagship campus and a day at one or more of the newer campuses. An evaluation of information from each of these visits is included in Section V and specific reports are included in the separately bound appendixes. Many respondents asked for a copy of the report and it is hoped that it may be of some value to other universities in order to help justify the time and efforts of so many busy people for interviews and completion of forms.

Section IV subdivides basic areas of administration into twenty-four necessary components and information is presented on the degree of desired centralization of each of these. The multicampus system must have an administrative structure to consider basic areas in a primary way but also be broad and deep enough to manage well those smaller components which require centralized and campus attention.

The results of interviews are presented as objectively as possible for each central office and campus studied. For some, their structure is so new that it is as yet unproven. Appendixes E, F and G are case reports of these. Although we all learn from the mistakes of others, this report focuses largely on the most successful structural elements of multicampus administration. The organizational charts show major position titles and lines of reporting, but reference to the discussion of each is important to understand better the duties of each officer listed on the chart and their interactions among their colleagues at the central level and with the campuses. The report is concluded with reinforced suggestions for effective structuring of multicampus systems.

A few references reflecting research of the early sixties drew conclusions which are valid today. Campus and central office interviews confirmed much of the published information about managing higher education, and especially the multicampus system. However, changes are so rapid, as forecasted by numerous references, that many descriptions of institutions in 1970 are already outdated.

Multicampus and consolidated universities have many advantages, but offsetting these advantages are inherent disadvantages. The most important detriment is removing the faculty and deans further from the level where many important decisions are made. This report indicates that any form of coordination among institutions which might otherwise compete is preferable to educational laissez faire. In states characterized by diverse and numerous institutions, coordination is best achieved by multicampus systems working with an advisory coordinating agency. In states with smaller populations, or those operating less hetrogeneous campuses, the consolidated model can be optimal. Some exceptions from these generalizations are noted in which the consolidated statewide systems appear to function better than multicampus systems. The ability of multicampus and consolidated systems to achieve their potential advantages over the inherent disadvantages depends largely on the administrative structure and the quality of personnel at both the central and campus levels. The quality of the state coordinating agency is important to the functions of multicampus systems, while consolidated systems eliminate the state coordinating agency for higher education.

To determine the potential advantages of systems, it is important to study the history and development of multicampus and consolidated university systems in this country. Although the fundamental goals and objectives of most systems are similar, historical factors, coordinating agencies and the varying degrees of state control all combine to make each have its own special characteristics.

Section VI integrating relevant published works, results of the original survey on centralization and interviews with administrators and faculty represents an evaluation and analysis of how a university system may approach its maximum potential. Because of local factors, historical influences and the number of campuses within a system, certain modifications may be necessary to optimize the system, or systems, for each state.

System administration functions most effectively when responsibility is divided among a panel of experts reporting directly to the system head. Each of these executives is charged with heading a management area, including academic affairs, administration, business and finance, university counsel, university relations and planning. The organizational structure tends to give the campuses more responsibility for operation and at the same time provides the system executive adequate staff support for central control of policy and those functions most important to uniting a system under the same or similar policies.

This report is designed to portray the functional areas to be served by the administrative structure whether a specific duty is executed by a single officer or shared by two or more. Objectivity is enhanced by considering administrative areas rather than the title of officers performing the duties. An officer filling a specific duty in a large system may require high level assistants to meet the demands of his position, while his counterpart in a smaller system may be able to assume duties outside his primary field. Whatever the size of the system or an officer's title and auxiliary duties may be, an individual should be predominantly responsible for only one basic function.

Clark Kerr has given Eugene Lee credit for a major role in the reorganization of the University of California system. Lee's experience and also that of his co-author, Frank Bowen, are broad; they have focused their attention directly on the multicampus university in an important book The Multicampus University. Accordingly, frequent reference is made to their book which reports on nine large systems in the United States. They make observations and draw conclusions which only persons having in-depth knowledge of multicampus systems could make. For example, they maintain that within the multicampus university, the relationships between the campus executive and his students may reflect better his relationship to the system than an explicit analysis of a campus-system relationship. They also note that the mobility of prestigious faculty and students can be altered by even small changes in the attractiveness of a campus. The present report emphasizes the importance of good basic data for aiding the decision making reliability of top administrators. I agree with Rourke and Brooks' emphasis on the importance of facts to the decision making process of any university.

> Institutional research is not only a tool for internal management but also for external information...Automatic data processing of routine matters allows more time of personnel to deal with students on a personal basis... Directors of institutional research should be technical consultants to top administrators...[1]

In the literature little is reported about the importance of the multicampus university planning with other public and private institutions in the geographic area served by one of its campuses. Planning with these institutions seems to be a responsibility of the multicampus university as it has the strength and the prestige to lead, and cooperative efforts are believed to be mutually beneficial to all. Interviews revealed that this cooperation was the policy of some campuses of a system, but not of the majority.

---

[1] In this paper references are numbered consecutively in each section and listed at the end of the section.

The duties of the system executive and his staff are most significant considerations. The interface of the system executive with the governing board is very important and a staff that can provide the executive sound recommendations in each basic administrative area is vital to successful administration. The system executive and campus executives must develop both formal and informal media for communications.

The institutions with a single state board, and with the head of each reporting directly to the board, are an interesting group which those following higher educational changes will be watching very closely. Many campuses seem pleased with this arrangement, except for the numerical expansion of the board staff, but the legislators in these states may not be as well satisfied as some educators seem to be. This class of institution was not a part of this study. In fact, no visits were made to state coordinating boards or other state agencies influencing institutions studied, except Kentucky. From campus and central office interviews, however, a general knowledge was gained on how these external agencies affect the institutions covered by the report. During the planning stage of the survey, visits were made to several national associations to seek advice on procedure; this proved to be very helpful.

Evidence suggests that many universities existing as multicampus systems in 1970 will move to consolidated systems of one board and one executive for the entire state. At the same time many independent institutions will be clustered into multicampus systems so that the net effect will be an increase in both types of systems.

Merl Baker
Merl Baker
Rolla, Missouri
July 1974

TABLE OF CONTENT

Page

Introduction 1

Section I. The Real World: External Pressures on Higher Education. 11

Chapter 1. Nonacademic Political Pressures 11
- The Political Scene 11
- Role of the Governor. 14
- Federal Government Influence. 14

Chapter 2. External Coordinating Pressures 17
- Reasons for Coordination. 17
- Three Approaches to Coordination. 21
  - A. Legislative Coordination 21
  - B. The External Coordinating Agency . 22
  - C. The Multicampus University As A Coordinating Agency 26

Section Summary 29

Section II. Response to Reality: The Multicampus Concept 37

Chapter 3. The Case For The Multicampus University . 37
- Introduction. 37
- The Rise of the Multicampus University. . 38
- General Structure and Composition of Multicampus Systems 39
- Evaluation of a Multicampus System. . . . 43

Chapter 4. Specific Advantages of Multicampus Systems 45
- Introduction. 45
- The Multicampus University As A Cushion Between State Politics and Higher Education. 46
- Diversity and Specialization as Strengths of Multicampus Universities . 47
- Better Management Avoids Replication. . . 49
- The Benefits of the Unified Budget for Multicampus Universities. . . 52
- Academic Program Planning Capabilities. . 53
- What Planning Can Accomplish. 56

Page

Planning for the Multicampus System . . . 57
Multicampus Structure Improves External Relations 65
Cooperation Encourages Systemwide Programs 67

Chapter 5. Qualifying Notes: Limitations of the Multicampus University 69

Introduction. 69
The Inherent Liabilities of the Multicampus System. 69
Special Problems of Multicampus Systems . 71

Section Summary 73

Section III. Incarnating the Concept: Internal Governance of the Multicampus University 87

Chapter 6. The Basic Elements of Administration at the System Level. 87

Introduction. 87
Role of the Governing Board 87
Role of the System Executive. 93
Responsibility of the System's Central Staff 98
The System Staff Executive Officers . . . 102
A. The Administrative Officer 102
B. The Academic Affairs Officer . . . 103
C. The Program Planning Officer . . . 104
D. The Business-Finance Officer . . . 106
E. The University Counsel 108
F. The University Relations Officer . 108
Administration of Extension 110
Research Administration 111
Alternate Administrative Officer Structure111

Chapter 7. Campus Elements in the Governance of Multicampus Systems. 113

The Campus Chief Executive. 113
The Faculty 118
The Student Body. 123
Alumni. 123

Chapter 8. Functional Relationships. 125

What Decisions Are Made Where 125
Management and Use of Resources 129

Chapter 9. New Trends. 137

Introduction. 137
Coordination. 138

Page

Chapter 10. Academic Leadership Required. 145

Section Summary. 148

Section IV. Statistical Analysis of Degree of Centralization Desired 173

Chapter 11. Description of Data Requested 173

Chapter 12. Analysis of Data. 175

Section V. Theory Varified: The University System in Contemporary Higher Education— Results of Campus and Central Office Visits. 193

Chapter 13. Establishing Statewide Coordination . . 193

Regulatory Agencies. 194
Administrative Personnel 199

Chapter 14. Administrative Aspects. 201

Internal Communication 201
Central and Campus Functions, A Summary. 204
Academic Planning in Action. 206
Ultimate Role of the Governing Board . . 208
The Multicampus University; Short Run Problems, Long Run Success . 209

Section VI. Integration of Literature Reports, Statistical Analysis and Visits to Central Offices and Campuses 215

Section Introduction 215

Chapter 15. Constitutional and Statutory Limitations of Educational Institutions. 217

Chapter 16. State Coordinating Agencies 221

Chapter 17. Multicampus Systems 223

Section Summary. 245

Bibliography. 259

Appendixes. 1

A. Letter to System and Campus Executives 1

B. University of Missouri Administrative Function Survey 3

(Appendixes C, D, E, F and G are
bound under separate cover)

INTRODUCTION

As the dust settles on the euphoric expansion of higher education in the last fifteen years, the educational community is pausing to take stock. While long noted for curricular expansions, only in recent years have American educational leaders demonstrated similar pliancy for institutional organization. The emergence of the multicampus university as a dominant structure of public higher education reflects the new pressures and expectations applied to education and signifies a renewed commitment to coordinated quality and efficient resource utilization.

This paper seeks to examine the pressures which generated the multicampus and consolidated concepts and explore systems of governance and administration most responsive to these pressures while preserving the quality of higher education. Both concepts have been spawned from an intricate web of external influences including political and economic pressures. In order to assess administrative structures an understanding of the origins and objectives of the multicampus university is a prerequisite. Once established, the goals and purposes of the multicampus university must be translated into descriptions of the necessary administrative officers and their roles. In addition to the system officers, the responsibilities of campus elements in universitywide management must also be considered.

The analyses will be limited to those institutions meeting the following definitions:

1. A single board and system executive with separate campus executives where the system does not include all of higher education in the state,
2. A consolidated system in states with a comparable population to Missouri with a single governing board for higher education and a central executive through whom all campus executives report,

3. Some selected institutions meeting the conventional definition of a multicampus university,[2] but lacking in some technical details, and
4. A few contrasting institutions not following the trend toward a more centralized organization, but operating regional campuses.

Correspondence was directed to one hundred and sixty-nine people, mostly system and campus executives, with invitations not only for their responses but also others of their choosing. Responses were received from two hundred and fifty-five people, and opinions and judgements were very valuable to the development of this report.

Before focusing on a description of the most desirable structure for the administration of a multicampus or consolidated university, both external and internal influences must be studied and evaluated. These are not the same in every state and some variations in the best administrative structures are to be expected.

A university may have many similarities with a public service type corporation. The students are the customers, the faculty and nonacademic staff are the employees, the chief executives and staffs have many parallel duties and the governing boards of each may function in a similar way; but the university has a much more powerful regulatory agency in the state's political system than the public utility corporation has from a public service commission. Administration of a multicampus or consolidated university is very complex and good management lies in a delicate interplay among forces of competing interests. Today, these universities are big business and this visibility makes them especially susceptible to amplified and most often unwarranted criticism from taxpayers and legislators.

---

[2] Eugene C. Lee and Frank M. Bowen, The Multicampus University (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 4. Their criteria for a multicampus system are: 1) Each had responsibility for only a portion of higher education in the state. 2) Each had more than one four-year campus. 3) Each had a systemwide executive with the title of president or chancellor. 4) This executive did not have specific responsibility for one of the campuses.

In constructing a model for the administrative structure of multicampus and consolidated universities, analyses will be made of both the external and internal forces which weigh heavily on the system executive, his front level staff and the campus executive and his staff. The campus executive must function as the leader of his campus. He requires the support of his deans and faculty as he implements system policy and carries out directives from its executive. These responsibilities may not always be compatible and the campus executive's role is a very difficult one. The system executive is also in a sensitive position as he is charged to lead and support his campus executives, but has the obligation to implement the policies of his board. He is often faced with reconciling differences between two responsible and reasonable, but nevertheless conflicting, views.

The governing boards of multicampus or consolidated systems are the buffer between the internal operations of the universities and the political and public expectations of the educational systems. The delegation of authority to the different levels of management within the system and the degree of compromise the system can afford to satisfy external critics are two major decision areas of boards and system executives. Success or failure of a system is largely dependent on correct decisions in these important areas. The general public may view membership on a governing board as an honorary position of high recognition, but it is far more than this. Dedicated board members spend many long hours pondering over the decisions on numerous issues of great importance to the university and the public which it serves.

Campus executives should be given as much autonomy as possible and still be responsible for implementing the policies of the system executive and the board. They should be given freedom for operation within established policies, but accountable for cooperation with other members of the system, good management of their campuses and helping to unite the system into a functional unit. This requires that administrators and faculty on different campuses work as a team just as is expected among divisions on any one campus. This cooperation is a strong characteristic of an effective multicampus university system.

In his recent book, Governing the University, Leon Epstein recognizes that the public university is not free to move too far on its own without likely threats of control by agencies of the state.[3] He perceives that any institution, even those with traditional freedom, are transparent to those who supply the money and to face this accountability is not unexpected. Dr. Epstein seems to have a broader understanding than most university scholars of the restraints placed on the faculty, deans, campus executives, system executives and governing boards from numerous external forces.

Administration of universities is now much more complex than in the past. Administrators must protect the academic freedom of their institutions, but the understanding of and cooperation among all elements are important to success. As always, administrators today have to be able to understand the internal requirements of the university and defend these to those outside justifiably expecting accountability. Although no substitute exists for qualified personnel, the well designed administrative structure of large complex institutions can be very helpful not only to internal governance but also to the enlightenment of external challengers.

The functional area that is currently managed in the least uniform way among the various systems studied is program planning, as its importance has been recognized only recently. Lack of program planning was not so visible during the expansion period of the sixties because resources were available for most proposed programs from both internal and external interests. During the austerity of the seventies, however, planning has become a most significant issue with the central office, the campuses and the public. Since academic programs are affected more by financial resource limitations than nonacademic ones, the program planning officer at the central level is required to have a solid academic background to help gain the understanding and cooperation of the campus faculties and administrators. Some systems have an officer for this function while others share the responsibility among officers.

This report proposes that the academic affairs officer of the central staff, reporting to the system executive, should devote his time heavily to representing the system executive to the faculty and students. He should be the system executive's liaison with these groups so that the system executive can give more time to direction of officers reporting to him, relationships with the board, interactions with the state government and participation in ceremonial affairs where only he can represent the university. The academic affairs officer frequently performs fewer of the primary duties expected of him in these important relations because of other assigned responsibilities much too diversified for any one person to master. Other managerial responsibilities studied in some detail in the report relate to business and finance, university relations, administration, university counsel, management of extension and coordination of research. These general areas of administration are important to effective management of any multicampus or consolidate university system. The expediency which the structure lends to their implementation enhances the success of the system.

References

[1] Richard E. Perry and Frank W. Hull, IV, The Organized Organization: The American University and its Administration (The University of Toledo, 1971).

[2] Eugene C. Lee and Frank M. Bowen, The Multicampus University (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 4.

[3] Leon Epstein, Governing the University (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), p. 2.

Section I. The Real World:
External Pressures on Higher Education

Chapter 1

NONACADEMIC POLITICAL PRESSURES

The Political Scene: Many references report that in most states members of the governing boards for higher education are appointed by the governor and the appointees' understanding of educational matters are not always seriously considered. The governor recommends the university's budget and it is finalized by the legislature. These actions clearly make the university a part of the state's political system. A multicampus or consolidated statewide system has many advantages in dealing with these restraints which will be discussed later. The size of a multicampus system makes it a highly visible target within the political environment and this can be disadvantageous. A fault on one campus may overshadow many meritorious accomplishments on others.

Legislators from the geographic area of a campus are often supporters of the system due to their interest in the local campus, but sometimes they become disenchanted with the campus within their district because of local politics and this can be damaging. The central administration of the system must continuously work to build a good mutual understanding with all elements of the political system, including those from the campus districts. Lee and Bowen conclude that the agencies of state government are active participants in the governing process of universities, not as outsiders, but as a part of the governing structure.[1]

For this study coordinating agencies and other state agencies which admittedly can have a powerful influence on universities, but which lack direct governing authority, are defined as external agents. The extent and method of exerting this power varies widely in different states, but it exists in all of them and many common issues prevail.

---

[1] In this paper references are numbered consecutively in each section and listed at the end of the section.

Probably no other single item attracts more attention among all elements of state government than the budget of a university system. It seems large and few people in any state capital have had the necessary experience to understand it and appreciate the services which the university renders.

Some factors cited by Lee and Bowen which make the system highly visible to political interests are:

a. Increased budget demands
b. Student activism
c. Public service or social action
d. The economic factor of the university locally and
e. The location of the new campuses[2]

The board, the system executive, and campus executives can minimize these dangers by good planning and effective team management.

For example, in the sixties the Texas Legislature added a new general campus and new medical units to the University of Texas prior to full evaluation and formal recommendation by the governing board. Educational leaders in any state can cite similar examples. The lack of a structured or planned model for higher education can permit political decisions without due process. It is evident that good academic program and budgetary planning are the best defense any multicampus or consolidated system can have to eliminate or alleviate serious political decisions on matters not previously studied thoroughly by executives and faculty and recommended by the governing board.

Lee and Bowen summarize the influence of the state:

> The impact of the state has equal implications for both board and system executive. The divided treatment emphasizes the frequent ambiguity that governmental involvement in the governance of public higher education can cause. The allocation of authority between the board and executive officer of a single campus university is probably no more precise, but in the multicampus system, the effects of vague allocation are reinforced by an "uncertainty factor." Once any decision

> leaves the physical boundaries of the campus, our study suggests, a few at the campus know precisely where it ends up. The campuses rarely think of the state as the contact with it. More often, they look to or blame a particular central staff officer or the system executive.[3]

Academic authorities should be independent within the context of public policy at the state and national level. External public agencies which influence the university include:

a. State coordinating councils
b. State legislatures
c. The governor's office
d. Federal agencies and
e. The national congress[4]

For institutions depending on state or federal financial support it is unrealistic to expect campus autonomy. Campus autonomy is unlikely to be achieved at a level entirely satisfactory to educators because of external financial dependencies and necessary coordination.

American universities, multicampus systems or single universities, are more often freer of external controls than their counterparts in other countries for historical reasons. Some of the reasons are given by the Carnegie Commission and summarized as follows:

1. Most of the earlier American universities were given birth by the church and separation of church and state kept political agencies from becoming involved.

2. The pluralistic political system with many centers of power including federal, state and local governments discouraged the national influence.

3. The protection of the freedom of speech of faculty members has been a characteristic of American universities.[5]

With the modern university so heavily dependent on public funds, it is not reasonable to expect it to return to the autonomy enjoyed by the early American university. Today we must recognize the existing outside influences and structure the internal system of government to cope with them. Internal administrative structures have not been designed to meet today's changing external forces affecting the university system as most structures have evolved from those adequate to cope only with the conditions of the past.

Role of the Governor: Lee and Bowen express their views of the power of the governor:

> The state governor today is the most important single official in a college's relation to state government. Not only does the governor lead the way in shaping the general fiscal policies that influence higher education, but also his power to appoint college governing boards, his role in many states as an "ex-officio" board member, and the resources of his personal staff all combine to place him in a commanding position to affect the activities of state colleges and universities.[6]

In many states he also has much power over the legislature, while in some states the strength of the legislature tends to dampen his influence on the university. The strength of the governor can be good or bad depending on his priority for the university, but even if he is favorable he has to confront many other state agencies competing with the university for scarce funds.

Because of the size of its budget and relative freedom from line item control in many states, the university system is highly visible to the governor. Actions and reactions of the governor are also readily noticed by the public, while those of other state agencies which can influence the university may be compromised with a minimum of public exposure and debate.

Federal Government Influence: Federal money reaches the campuses in different ways, some through state coordinating agencies and such funds can be crucial in relationships among faculty members, the campus, the multicampus management and state government. Federal support for research and special projects usually goes directly for the use of the proposing faculty member, and although this type of support is a large percentage of total federal funding to the institution, its administration proceeds with minimum external controls. The system executive's chief academic officer and the chief business and financial officer must monitor commitments of an ongoing nature from funds for faculty salaries because the level of support fluctuates widely. Millett observes that in many universities funding of research projects is integrated into the overall university financial planning. Reduction of these federal funds can be most detrimental to advanced level graduate education.[7] Many tenured faculty members receive a large share of their salaries from these funds, sometimes up to one-half, depending on the policy of the institution. Internal management has to be structured to provide flexibility without financial disruption from federal changes, and this is both a campus and central responsibility.

Chapter 2

EXTERNAL COORDINATING PRESSURES

Reasons for Coordination: The day of several independent public institutions in the same state competing for scarce resources is over, or is approaching the end. State legislators and the taxpaying public are very much concerned about efficient use of resources and elimination of wasteful duplication. Unless other forms of coordination exist in each state, the legislature is most likely to assume this role. There are various coordination systems that better serve the needs of the public and the universities than direct resolution by the legislature and most states have adopted one of these.

No educator doubts that the legislature in each state can be the ultimate coordinator because of fiscal control. The interest of higher education is better served and the understanding of the legislature enhanced by having an educationally enlightened buffer placed between the legislature and the universities; this is the foundation of coordinating agencies. Coordinating agencies include the following: (a) advisory, (b) regulatory, (c) a state board without an executive between the campus executives, (d) a state board with an executive to whom the campus executives report and (e) a multicampus system with a central executive to whom the campus heads report. These configurations are not necessarily mutually exclusive as multicampus systems in the same state require coordination. The multicampus system gives educators and boards an excellent opportunity for flexibility in decision making, academic planning and resource allocation, if not strangled by an inflexible or politically dominated coordinating agency. Educators are better prepared to make decisions on higher education than legislators, lay board members or commissioners, but legislators and taxpayers alike often lack confidence in the multicampus system in achieving coordination and efficient utilization of resources. The confidence in the multicampus system is stronger than trust in a group of separate institutions, but most systems have not yet achieved the management expertise of which they are capable. When their potential level of performance is reached, credibility with the legislatures and public will be greatly enhanced. Failures of multicampus systems to achieve their potential for service have given rise to stronger state coordinating agencies.

Sharing of expensive research equipment and cooperation of faculties from similar departments on different campuses are possible characteristics of multicampus systems which enable high quality doctoral and research programs at much lower costs than if each functioned independently. Demonstration of this capability will do much to command the respect and support of the taxpaying public and the elected officials representing them, and to discourage the formation of inflexible state coordinating boards.

In 1972 the University of Maryland recognized that the number of graduate programs existing on two older campuses plus others being proposed by two new entries into the system would comprise a formidable list. This expansion was anticipated to appear costly to the coordinating and other state agencies. Moreover, the university feared that the proposals would appear unnecessary and excessive to meet the state's needs. The policy was advanced that two or more campuses would cooperate in programs resembling existing ones. Joint undertakings were to be listed as university-wide programs of a single entity— not as duplicating ones. Each campus has its graduate faculty and graduate dean reporting through the usual faculty and administrative channels. Students may elect a major professor on the campus of their choice for cooperative universitywide programs, but faculty from another cooperating campus will assist in the program of each student. Not all programs are cooperative ones but these are especially advantageous for newer campuses. A reduced inventory of degree programs for the total university is well received by taxpayers in any state. Academically it musters the resources of more than one campus to benefit the students.

The University of Maryland has a vice-president in the central office to administer these cooperative programs with the help of a graduate council having representatives from all campuses. An alternate to this vice-presidency would be the graduate deans of all campuses administrating it as an executive committee of the system-wide graduate council.

A danger of very strong external coordinating agencies is described by the Carnegie Commission:

> Not only the competence of the staff but also the nature of the agency's authority may affect its ability to carry out this entire range of functions. Coordinating agencies with administrative responsibilities and single governing boards undoubtedly find it easier to avoid wasteful duplication than do advisory agencies. The stronger types of agencies could achieve great efficiency in the use of scarce resources, but unduly rigid and detailed budget review approaches could actually inhibit the type of organizational innovation needed for more efficient use of resources. It is also possible that their regulatory functions could impede improvement of communications and thus affect the spirit and thoroughness with which institutions supply data.[8]

According to the Carnegie Commission a single governing board of a state exerts great influence on administrative functions of a system only if its board has adequate statewide planning capability.[9] This study suggests, however, that the best planning starts with the campuses to minimize duplications and fill gaps. A campus plan is evaluated and refined by the central staff of the system and board; finally it is reviewed by the statewide board. The governing and coordinating boards are the same for a statewide consolidated system.

Most states have some type of coordinating agency but their authority and influence vary widely. A board of higher education is powerful if the legislature usually honors its recommendations. In some other states advisory type coordinating agencies have gained little credibility with either the institutions or the legislature.

Most multicampus systems serve important coordinating functions, as the example cited for the University of Maryland shows. Often, however, they have difficulty in demonstrating to state governments that they can serve better in cooperation with an advisory coordinating commission than if regulated by an agency of the state. Some of the strengths of multicampus systems in effective coordination are described subsequently, however, not all multicampus systems have fully realized these potentials.

Cooperation among the campuses of a system is essential. No one campus should expect to have highly qualified faculty in all specialities, but a pooling of resources can enable the system to reach or approach the highest quality in each specialty and subspeciality. The central administration should take the initiative to achieve the best possible degree of cooperation and specialization among campuses in order to build quality in both instruction and research, but simultaneously achieve diversity among campuses. Cooperation can be demonstrated if a mission oriented research unit functions on two or more campuses. Most systems expect the academic officer of the central staff to be the catalyst and coordinator for academic cooperation between (and among) campuses. Many arguments are presented that mission oriented research units can be coordinated as effectively as academic departments. Research facilities on one campus should be available to qualified researchers from other campuses. This availability and encouraged participation promotes cooperation of departments and mission oriented research units and thus eliminates the duplication of specialized equipment.

Millett has stated that replication is not duplication if each unit of the multicampus system has a critical mass of programs to utilize effectively faculty and capital facilities. Many valid arguments indicate that quality suffers unless this critical mass is achieved.[10] The academic officer of the central staff is concerned about quality and the academic program planner for the system, if one exists, also wants to serve external needs of the state. They should work together in advising the system's executive in regard to the critical mass for each program. Cost analyses and institutional research data are essential to their evaluation.

The multicampus system has the capability of pooling faculty among campuses in advanced graduate programs to achieve the critical mass for quality and more effective use of faculty and facilities in each speciality. Unfortunately, too few systems have fully achieved this potential; the doctoral faculty proposed for the University of Missouri hopefully will develop to meet these objectives. Cooperative efforts among campuses can permit the small number of graduate faculty members in departments of newly developing departments, colleges and campuses to be a part of already established programs. This arrangement does not increase the inventory of programs identically designated. If these elements of cooperation and conservation described in this and preceding paragraphs are achieved, pressure for rigid external coordination would be greatly lessened.

Three Approaches to Coordination:

A. Legislative Coordination: Lee and Bowen describe the power of the legislature as a coordinator:

> Legislatures, through the budget process, are, in fact, the ultimate coordinating agencies in the states. They are not seen as such, however, by the campuses of the multicampus universities, and this negative finding is of consequence. The campuses do not, for instance, see the formal statewide coordinat-

> ing agency as necessary to "protect" them from political intervention by the legislature.[11]

Many legislatures allocate resources to independent institutions and campuses of a system by formulas, and when this exists the best information possible on cost of programs within the multicampus system is essential.

The potential danger of an inflexible cost formula being applied to all programs by the legislature, or by an uninformed coordinating agency, is cause for serious concern for all institutions of higher education, but especially for the multicampus systems. The formula, if used, must account for cost of different levels of instruction, types of instruction, research, nonresident teaching and numerous elements of support; most of these vary with enrollment. Other costs are determined by existing programs and the physical plant, and are unrelated to the student credit hours taught. A simple inflexible formula would spell disaster for the research level universities in the state and give a windfall gain to institutions with a preponderance of low cost programs. Most legislatures will debate the effectiveness between coordinating agencies and the multicampus university. The best justification for the multicampus university in this debate is to improve its academic program planning and resource allocations; then working with the coordinating agency is for a common cause. If this cooperation fails to prevail, legislative intervention is inevitable.

B. The External Coordinating Agency: A coordinating agency theoretically exists as an objective interface between state government and the educational institutions in order to serve the public better. States, including those with multicampus universities, have established coordinating agencies unless a statewide governing board exists. The advantage to higher education is determined by the extent to which these agencies are autonomous from state government and exemplify that they and the educational system have a mutual responsibility in providing quality higher education.

Coordinating agencies are usually advisory but many have regulatory authority over certain functions of the universities such as new programs and budgets. Even an advisory agency can be very powerful if its opinions are accepted often by the state legislature and communication between it and the university system, or systems, of the state is very important.

A single governing board in a state has the combined responsibilities of multicampus systems and a coordinating agency. The dual role of governance and coordination is believed compatible if institutions are similar, but when a single board has to govern and coordinate all institutions from junior colleges through research level universities, its duties are indeed complex and difficult. Lee and Bowen describe a system made up of dissimilar institutions as a comprehensive system while one made up of units of similar academic levels and compatible objectives as a segmental system.[12] The comprehensive multicampus or consolidated system does not lose, in the opinion of this writer, the advantages of the multicampus system, but complexity of management is increased. If institutions with different goals or academic levels are in the same system, much pressure will be exerted to upgrade some of the lower level institutions to the higher level of the system, but the central administration and board of the system should be in a better position to establish control by category than would external coordinating agencies. Whether true or not, the belief is prevalent among research level universities that external coordinating agencies often tend to favor the average and below average institution in quality rather than promote a system of excellence for those institutions which have the potential to achieve it. However, many coordinating agencies have been successful in differentiating among categorical requirements of different types of institutions.

The Carnegie Commission recognizes the need for more effective postsecondary education, but it recommends that the states strongly resist:

> 1. Investing (sic) coordinating agencies with administrative authority, particularly over the budget matters, or 2. Establishing single governing boards, except in those states in which a special combination of historical factors and present circumstances make such agencies more feasible than other types of coordinating agencies.[13]

This writer believes that the single board has merit in states with only a few institutions, but for larger states with many institutions, such as Missouri, multicampus systems seem superior. Florida is considered an exception because of historical factors. Even with its single governing board for all four year colleges and universities, the legislature has added campuses before the board has had the opportunity for a thorough study of need and justification.

Probably because of budgetary limitations, very few external coordinating agencies have seriously encouraged efforts at institutions to improve quality or stimulate innovation. In defense of external agencies, universities and systems of universities, tend to be slow to change. The political realities which influence the coordinating agencies can give them leverage to promote activities that are more in keeping with the changing times whether or not this is favorable to higher education. Yet the coordinating agency has the charge to be an advocate of higher education to the extent of meeting the needs of the state.[14]

In most states the coordinating executive, his staff and board constitute an agency of the state, but it should have an independent base, divorced from political control, as enjoyed by most universities. The coordinating board's potential political vulnerability weakens its ability to serve as a good interface between state government and the university. Coordinating agencies in most states are staffed with civil service employees at a lower pay schedule than universities and this can create difficult personal relationships between the two executives and their respective staffs.

In states where a multicampus system is influential, it can steer the coordinating agency in the proper direction of cooperation so that higher education can better serve the citizens of the state. The forces deterring the objectivity of the external coordinating agency should be counteracted by the multicampus system as a strong component of better coordination of higher education in the state. If decisions which should be made by the multicampus system are made totally by the external coordinating agency, then responsibility and authority of the system have been lost or degraded and the partnership relationship dissolved.

Multicampus system leaders often feel that coordinating agencies interfere rather than work in partnership with them to meet the state's needs. As a start in minimizing conflict with coordinating agencies, the multicampus university has to avoid unwarranted duplication and evolve degrees of specialization for each campus. As an example of good institutional initiative, the University of California formerly classified each of its campuses, except one medical campus, as general campuses, but recently newer campuses have been assigned more narrow missions. However, as an opposite example, the coordinating agency's study of engineering in California, before reassignment of campus missions, altered plans of the university to expand engineering to new campuses. Time proved the opinion of the coordinating agency to be correct, but seemingly better relationships would have resulted in the minds of the taxpayer and legislators if the lack of need for more engineering schools had been recognized first by the university.

In spite of its potential value to serve as a buffer between the university and the state government, however, the coordinating agency can be weak in documentation of its recommendations. Robert O. Berdahl cites an example in the sixties of the power of the legislature over the advisory coordinating commission in California:

> ...all programs presented—so far have been approved. Both the University and the State Colleges have able sophisticated planning staffs and have developed internal review procedures. Both segments have followed council criteria in good faith.[15]

The commission in this case was criticized by the legislature for being too protective of the academic interests and its recommendation had little influence on the legislature.

Many report that prestige appears to result more from the academic strength of major systems than from size, although geographical dispersion of the multicampus university gives it a political advantage. This gain is counteracted by many coordinating agencies being arms of state government rather than serving as an important interface between state government and higher education. Sometimes multicampus systems fail to recognize the proper role of the coordinating agency, but if the agency has demonstrated or expressed bias against the higher educational system, an appropriate working relationship for the common cause of better education in the state and mutual efforts for effective utilization of resources are indeed difficult.

C. The Multicampus University As A Coordinating Agency: Of the possible approaches for coordination, multicampus university systems are the most desirable models for states with widely diversified institutions. The multicampus system is a coordinating agency whether it is a system of similar institutions or one of very diverse institutions. It is favored by the public and the legislature over independent competing institutions. The extent of this favor depends on how well the system is administered. The next logical consideration is a delineation of the educational and public advantages of a multicampus system over separate competing institutions. The multicampus university can be a great aid to an objective external coordinating agency in helping discipline the ambitions of independent public institutions within the state.

An established campus of national stature, Berkeley, for example, has not lost stature by addition of other campuses of university status to the system. Unproven is the ability of a comprehensive system of institutions of different goals and levels to build a few institutions of outstanding national quality, and maintain others to meet only regional needs. Some may be approaching success as in Florida and Georgia. No state has the resources to build many institutions to the research university status, especially if they are comprehensive in program scope. Planned differences are a greater problem to single governing board states and to multicampus systems of dissimilar institutions than to systems of campuses of similar academic levels as exist in Missouri or California.

It is argued by some that "coordination" has to be accomplished independently of the multicampus university. However, management of the system, in the opinion of this writer, includes the obligation to regulate programs in order not only to build quality by campus specialization, but also to utilize resources more effectively through cooperation among campuses.

Multicampus systems have more expertise in allocating resources among academic units than external agencies since varied and experienced educational judgments can be exercised. The system is not achieving its potential if it serves only as a channel to move funds from the State to each campus, nor is it supporting each campus properly if allocations are made with an inadequate information base or deficient administrative leadership. Lee and Bowen recognize the importance of internal budgeting among members of the multicampus system and when this challenge is met, translation of budgetary needs and priorities to satisfy external challenges should be as easy as the extra point by a star kicker after the touchdown:

> Even the strongest system executive must have objective bases for his campus budgetary decisions. His relationships with the campus

> executives and their authority on the campuses depend heavily on mutual acceptance of the validity of the budgetary process. Total agreement cannot be expected, but each campus must feel it is being treated "fairly" vis-a-vis other campuses in the system. Internal pressures for equity among campuses would impel the creation of formulas, even if they were not required by state government or by the need for simplification.[16]

Equity in the internal budget must allow for many program differences while the external justification for most of these important operating details may be presented in more general packages.

The multicampus university as a coordinator is summarized by Lee and Bowen:

> Thus, it is argued, a multicampus university with its ability to attract competent specialists to its central staff can do for itself and its campuses what the coordinating agency would normally be expected to do for separate campuses.[17]

If more than one system exists in a state a flexible coordinating agency is needed to help the systems retain their respective missions. A state commission is more effective in coordinating two or more systems than all independent campuses or one system and several independent campuses.

SECTION SUMMARY

Consistent with Thomas Jefferson's vision, over two-thirds of higher education in America today is funded and administered in the public sector. As such, public universities are agencies of state governments and ultimately accountable to the citizens of a state. Seventy years ago when public institutions occupied the minority role in higher education, they attracted little attention from the taxpaying public. Since the turn of the century, however, enrollment proportions in the public and private sectors have been inverted. Today the state university invariably occupies a prominent position in any state budget and programs. The result is a heightened interest in coordination and efficiency; the taxpayer rightfully insists on his money's worth. Administrative structures of universities or systems of institutions have not yet been adjusted to cope with changing external expectations in an optimum way.

This necessary and desirable coordination may be effected in three ways or combinations thereof. Ultimately, of course, the state legislature will exercise its judgment on matters of educational propriety under its appropriating authority. This is unfortunate since legislative coordination is frequently characterized by an heuristic approach to resource allocation. Being reasonable people, however, legislators rarely insist on exercising complete control over every item of every university's budget. In most states, a coordinating agency for education has been established to deal with this allocation problem by studying the state's needs and resources.

Coordinating agencies, the second method of managing a state's educational programs, are better suited to the task than busy legislators. Frequently exercising only advisory functions or having ties to the state's political arms, such agencies often do too little to improve quality or stimulate innovation. Moreover, they are often charged with coordinating education at all levels and hence develop little expertise in any single aspect of education. The contrast of postsecondary level services to the research level universities is a good example. To successfully allocate the resources available to higher education, a more comprehensive system of coordination is needed than the typical state coordinating agency.

Billowing into this coordinating vacuum in recent years is the multicampus university. Its basic claim to success is that educators, not legislators or civil servants, have the predominent responsibility to direct the allocation of the university's resources. Why many states have adopted the multicampus or consolidated concept is not always clear. A North Carolina legislator recently explained the decision to consolidate the state's sixteen campuses: "We did it to keep sixteen irritating lobbyists out of the statehouse during appropriations time!" Whether completely accurate or not, the lawmaker's observation does illustrate an important advantage of multicampus or a single statewide consolidated organization; campuses don't publicly compete for funds. Resources and programs are allocated internally, usually with the aid of the vast managerial expertise theoretically available within a large university system. Working with the state coordinating agency and realizing the legislature could pounce at any moment, the multicampus university emerges as a compromise solution. It is the educator's answer to fulfilling the public duty of efficiency without sacrificing academic quality, although consolidated systems may be substituted with some of the same advantages. Indeed, a properly structured multicampus or consolidated university enhances its academic excellence by its ability to specialize and develop diversity within a carefully coordinated framework. A multicampus system of institutions at a similar academic level appears superior to a comprehensive multicampus system or a single system for the entire state except for certain historical or unusual factor in some states and a small number of institutions in others. A multicampus system, which does not encompass all of higher education in the state, must work in partnership with an enlightened advisory type coordinating agency divorced from political allegiances.

References

[1] Eugene C. Lee and Frank M. Bowen, The Multicampus University (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 29.

[3] Ibid., p. 117.

[4] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 18.

[5] Ibid.,

[6] Lee and Bowen, p. 30.

[7] John D. Millett, Resource Reallocation in Research Universities (Washington, D. C., Academy for Educational Development, Inc.), pp. 24-30.

[8] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Capitol and the Campus (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), p. 27.

[9] Ibid., p. 27.

[10] Millett,

[11] Lee and Bowen, p. 35.

[12] Ibid.,

[13] Carnegie Commission, Capitol, pp. 28-29.

[14] Lee and Bowen, p. 4

[15] Robert O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education (Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1971), p. 16.

[16] Lee and Bowen, p. 256.

[17] Ibid., p. 56.

Section II. Response to Reality: The Multicampus Concept

Chapter 3

THE CASE FOR THE MULTICAMPUS UNIVERSITY

Introduction: As Clark Kerr observes:

> The freestanding campus with its own board, its one and only president, its identifiable alumni, its faculty and student body, all in a single location and with no coordinating council above it, is now the exception whereas in 1945 it was the rule.[1]

Lee and Bowen describe the multicampus university as one of the most extensive and significant developments in university organization in the past quarter century. At the end of the sixties the nine systems studied by them enrolled over 900,000 students. These included two systems in California, two in New York, one each in North Carolina, Wisconsin, Missouri, Texas and Illinois. Lee and Bowen report that the record of these institutions through the sixties has been impressive, but the real test will come in the seventies.[2]

Educators are ready to take issue with external critics, but not so well prepared to explain why there are so many of these critics. Rourke and Brooks have a good insight into this problem:

> Universities are the source of constant intellectual and scientific innovation for the society as a whole, and yet as many observers have noted, university personnel are highly reluctant to accept change in the operation of the university itself.
>
> Faculty members who constantly seek to break new ground in their own discipline may steadfastly resist any innovation in university management. Administrative officers often find it difficult to accept departures from the traditional way of doing things.[3]

> Changes have brought basic modification in the administrative structure of educational institutions.[4]

A multicampus system does demonstrate more flexibility than a group of single campus institutions. Because of the system's public visibility, its number of campuses is often determined by external pressures rather than needs. Systems are a departure from the status quo stated by Rourke and Brooks, but conversely, if decisions are made by political forces alone, they may not be the educationally correct ones.

All institutions, and especially multicampus systems, have sought ways— although sometimes feebly— to utilize resources more effectively. Offices of institutional research have been established to expedite progress. Another advantage of institutional research is an information bank for a better balance of teaching loads among departments and more efficient space utilization. Institutional research officers are at least a partial answer to a question that J. Victor Baldridge raised:

> However, if a man wants to know something about the organizational and administrative feature of universities— the home of those researchers— then by and large there is a great vacuum of information.[5]
>
> Where faculties are powerful scientific management has not yet brought radical changes in internal organizations.[6]

Many multicampus universities are making rapid progress toward resolving traditional restraints, yet others have barely begun.

The Rise of the Multicampus University: In the forward to Lee and Bowen's book, Clark Kerr states:

> The multicampus system has become a significant feature of higher education in the United States since World War II. Forty percent of all students now attend schools which are parts of multicampus institutions, and more than one-fifth of all campuses are constituent elements of these new higher education conglomerates.

> Three organizational changes of great importance have affected higher education over the past quarter of a century: (1) the introduction of students into governing mechanisms, (2) the creation of statewide coordinating councils, and (3) the rise of the multicampus system.
>
> Systems are the order of the day. National systems dominate in France, England, Russia, Sweden, and many other countries. The American counterpart has been the coordinating council and the multicampus institution, separately or in conjunction. So that here, as in much of the rest of the world, more is now done centrally and less is done by the campus itself. Several forces are working almost universally in this direction.[7]
>
> In most states the line between public and private institutions was relatively clear-cut for over a century. Not every nation has had a similar experience in maintaining two such distinctive sectors in higher education. Doing so in the United States has meant the development of a legal tradition of state authority for public universities, in contrast to the protected status of private institutions, and this tradition accompanies the democratic theory of popular control.[8]

The freedom of the private institutions provides a model for the public universities to defend against external encrouchment on basic freedoms, and the size of the multicampus university is a strong asset in protecting basic academic independency.

General Structure and Composition of Multicampus Systems:

The structure and composition of multicampus systems is expected to vary because of different historical factors and needs in the various states. Clark Kerr's perception of shifting power in higher education is most enlightening as this has greatly influenced the organizational patterns of university systems.

> Two of these developments (coordinating councils and multicampus systems) have been part of the fundamental process of shifting power

> in recent times from the campus to instrumentalities outside the campus to a greater extent than ever before in American history. While most eyes have been directed to the struggle over power within the campus (students versus faculty, versus administration), the really important phenomenon has been that there is constantly less power on campus; the more meaningful but largely hidden battle has been over how much less campus authority there would be.[9]

Some states have a single governing board for all of the four-year and research universities in the state and others even include junior colleges along with the senior institutions. Other states have gone to systems of multicampus universities in which campuses of the same academic level are grouped together with a central administrative officer and one governing board for each of the systems. Each campus has an executive officer reporting to the central executive. California is an excellent example of this latter arrangement. The board and central administration of the multicampus system becomes a coordinating agency, and in states in which this type of system exists, such as California, the state coordinating agency is more likely to be advisory rather than regulatory. This combination seems a distinct advantage for higher education to render optimum service with resources made available to it.

A multicampus system of similar institutions has administrative advantages over a heterogenous system. The State University of New York and the City University of New York City are examples of systems containing institutions of greatly varying types ranging from research universities to two-year institutions. Georgia is an example of a single state governing board and central administration with a wide range of institutions from research universities to junior colleges. When the system has a wide diversity of types of institutions, the central administration and the board have the additional responsibility of placing the institutions in their proper category, in contrast to a segmented multicampus system, which encompasses only campuses of similar objectives. In systems with very wide differences in academic levels of institutions, difficulty is experienced in avoiding the feeling that some members are second class citizens. Financial considerations alone would preclude too many research level institutions for any state. Systems of similar institutions at the research level have protected graduate education and research, but this protection is believed to be weakened in a system of dissimilar institutions. Yet, even this type of system has distinct advantages over competing independent institutions.

City University of New York has approached this problem by establishing a systemwide graduate center in which each campus with qualified graduate faculty is encouraged to participate. Some institutions make major contributions to the graduate center while others offer less. The argument for the center is that a campus of the system with too few graduate level faculty, or too limited resources, can participate in the center along with all other members of the system without feeling that it has second-class citizenship. The center concept within a system, whether including all or only a part of the members, can assemble a critical mass for quality in a given field and also better satisfy the public with a reduction in the inventory of graduate degree programs.

Lee and Bowen emphasize that the theme of a multicampus system should be diversity, specialization and cooperation, but cooperation may well be lacking especially in systems of dissimilar institutions.[10] Both City University of New York and the University of Maryland have diligently pursued cooperative graduate programs but opinions of the degree of success vary.

Lee and Bowen describe the true multicampus university as follows:

1. The single executive budget. When the system executive has a 'decisive' role in budget formulation, probably when a single executive budget for the entire university is introduced.

2. Appointment of campus executives. When the system executive recommends the appointment of the campus executives, and none are appointed without such recommendation.

3. Line and staff. When all lines of authority from campus level to multicampus level run through the campus executive.

4. Campus administrative authority. When the campus executive has specified authority commensurate with his responsibility and status. Definitions of the specific areas of such authority and whether it should be 'substantial' or 'total' produce endless argument. Major suggestions are: (a) academic and administrative appointments and promotions; (b) budget transfers of all but most critical items; and (c) flexibility to organize the campus administration.

5. Symbolism. (a) When the system executive moves his office or residence away from the flagship campus. (b) When the football team of a new campus within the system beats that of the flagship campus. (c) When the campus executives are not (or are) representatives to prestigious national educational groups.

6. Faculty authority. When the campus faculty controls its own academic destiny, free from detailed regulation by either the system administration or any systemwide faculty organization. Or, paradoxically, when the systemwide faculty organization has control over its academic destiny.[11]

Lee and Bowen report, and this is confirmed by recent campus visits of this observer, that meetings of campus executives chaired by the system executive—without participation of others—are frequently held in large systems with effective results. In the late sixties large systems had a far higher incidence of systemwide faculty and student activists than smaller ones. External pressure will prompt more systems of dissimilar institutions in the seventies than in the sixties and this would increase the complexity of administration of multicampus systems.[12]

Evaluation of a Multicampus System: Clark Kerr expresses the positive and negative very succinctly:

> Thus, a multicampus system is strong on the possible positive results—diversity, specialization, cooperation, effective use of resources, advance planning, and so forth—and weak on the negative aspects of process—bureaucratization, disenfranchisement of faculty and student informal influence, complexities in administrative relationships, political interference, and so forth... The central question about any multicampus system is whether it improves results—particularly the adequacy of advance planning, the enhancement of diversity and quality, the effective use of resources, and the successful representation to external authorities—more than it impedes the processes of governance.[13]

The campus structures of multicampus systems are complex and permit less freedom than that of a single independent campus, but those concerned about these inherent disadvantages must weigh them against the advantages of the system which includes more protection from political control, better funding resulting from unified geographic political support, better coordination and better quality through shared resources. When those critics of the multicampus system reflect on the offsetting advantages, then and only then do they have the perspective for evaluation.

To this observer the multicampus system has an inherent potential to achieve superiority over independent campuses. The degree of superiority is believed to be diminished for large multicampus systems of widely diversified institutions or consolidated statewide systems. The latter dimunition would be less noticeable if the number of campuses in diversified systems were small. Yet a system of campuses of different academic levels is superior to competing independent institutions. The administrative structure and qualifications of officers filling important central and campus positions are very important to the system in maximizing its advantages and minimizing its inherent restraints on governance.

Chapter 4

SPECIFIC ADVANTAGES OF MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS

Introduction: A multicampus system permits the central administration to experiment with not only innovative study programs but different campus administrative structures as well. This is a component of the diversity which is one of the often stated advantages of the multicampus system.

Lee and Bowen juxtapose the advantages and disadvantages of multicampus systems:

> In most areas of academic governance, the purported advantages of the multicampus structure depend on the variety of resources that it can command, its ability to direct the efforts of particular campuses along specialized lines of educational endeavor, its wide array and variety of faculty talent, and its greater potential for encouraging intercampus cooperation. The ability to marshal great academic resources is derivative of size, and the nine multicampus universities studied are among the largest in the United States. The advantages of these diverse academic resources, however, is often hampered by inherent problems of large numbers of campuses, students, and faculty. Size alone is rarely considered an academic asset.[14]

A multicampus system can afford a wide range of administrative expertise which would be too costly for a single university. Some expert personnel can be located in the central administration and others on the campuses and a free exchange of services is beneficial.

The multicampus system has greater flexibility in serving students seeking entrance to public higher education. If one campus of a system is filled, a high probability exists that an opening can be found for the student on another campus of the system. Certainly by concentrating programs of low enrollment on only a few campuses, student population will be adequate to achieve this special instruction at low cost, while a single institution would be faced with too few students to defend the program economically or would not offer it at all.

The Multicampus University As a Cushion Between State Politics and Higher Education: The central administration of the multicampus system, especially the system executive, gives high priority of time to establishing good relationships with the governor, state agencies and the legislature. The system executive should be able to answer inquiries more favorably on behalf of the university than the heads of several independent campuses. By collectively reporting all programs for the system, a few high cost programs could be justified if the overall costs were reasonable. If one campus has problems, but the system as a whole looks good, political attention can be diverted to some extent from the one campus with problems. The system should assure reasonable productivity in each department commensurate with the resources invested, and this is pleasing to external interests.

A strong specific argument favoring a multicampus system is in terms of its ability to plan academic programs and sell these to the decision makers in the state government. This is a very important buffer between the campuses and the legislature.

Lee and Bowen state very important special advantages of multicampus systems not always recognized by faculty and deans:

> The multicampus university should have superior technical and professional resources, and these are not directly tied to personal leadership styles. On the face of it, the system should be able to mount television or radio programs of greater scope and variety than a single campus, to respond to legislative inquiries on policy issues with a range of expertise not otherwise available, and to mobilize the expanded alumni of a multicampus system.

> These are not insignificant benefits, and a measure of success of the multicampus university is the extent to which it realizes this potential.[15]

Another strong point of the system is the ability to allocate resources among campuses by enlightened boards and central administrators in contrast to the politically competitive decisions which face independent institutions. A local legislator may feel constituency pressure to do more for a campus in his district, but if he votes to appropriate according to his conscience to the system, he is freed of personal criticism from those who may be at odds with the local campus and is given credit by those pursuing more support to the campus. This is good for both the legislator and the multicampus system.

Diversity and Specialization As Strengths of Multicampus Systems: If an independent campus specializes too extensively it is likely to suffer a serious enrollment drop so that fixed costs increase as a percentage of total cost. In a multicampus system planned specialization will take students away from a campus in restricted program areas, but it would cause a gain for other campuses having these areas. A planned balance of enrollment and programs should be established among campuses but no campus should be planned for so small an enrollment or narrowness of program scope to afflict quality penalties or high unit cost; this cost can increase from necessary services unrelated to enrollment.

Planned diversity among the campuses of the system to serve the state better, improve quality and lower per student costs is a capability of the multicampus system which should have very high priority among administrators and boards. Each campus of the system should be viable, identifiable and visible at the national level and serve the local area in a general way.

The multicampus university is designed to promote specialization, diversity and cooperation, and enable general services to the local area at a relatively low cost, if not met by other institutions.

States with a single board system can achieve many of the advantages of the multicampus system, and from an external viewpoint little difference may be detected. Internal management by a single board of many diverse institutions has administrative complexities that are inherent. Local conditions, however, can enable a consolidated statewide system to operate effectively. The results of this study reveal that the number of campuses and their differences in level are more important variables for characterising a multicampus system in contrast to a consolidated statewide system than differences in governance.

Most campus executives in multicampus systems prefer that the division of labor and responsibility place the system executive in contact with political forces of the state, allowing the campus executive to spend his time with students, deans, faculty and alumni. This sharing is skewed toward the campuses for federal contacts since both the campuses and federal agencies want to interact with professional counterparts. Since these interactions are usually without political significance, they should be campus responsibilities. The central administration, however, needs to keep abreast of changing federal policies which can have an impact on university planning.

An understanding of the shared duties and responsibilities among different academic interests is important to a-achieve solidarity to cope with external pressures. Epstein explains this from the faculty viewpoint:

> In fact, professors often believe that university administrators and regents overreact in trying to avoid unpopular policies for fear of gubernatorial and legislative budget cutting. Perhaps so, assuming that the principle at stake is important enough to risk the loss of funds. But it requires only a little knowledge of a university's relations with a state to realize that the possible loss of funds is not myth. There is no time like legislative budget making

> for a university's responsible leaders to be conscious of the policy-making authority of state officials.
>
> At any rate, most state universities are not even to this extent insulated by constitutional status from the legislature's plenary power to organize or reorganize the state's higher education system. The use of this power over the last two decades has been frequent and contentious. It will remain so as state governors and legislatures, more than ever, seek economically to rationalize the relationships of their public colleges and universities.[16]
>
> I am not thinking here of the commission's disapproval of the fairly widespread extension of state control through personnel systems, purchasing procedures, building plans, and the like. These devices, like line-item budgets, often seem clumsy and unnecessary. For instance, the public interest can be served at least as well, and the university's better, if the university is allowed to have its own classified civil service for its secretarial and maintenance employees. But an important principle is raised when universities resist the authority of the state to determine how higher education funds are to be allocated. There is a substantial public interest in the allocation of funds as among various broad programs and as among campuses.[17]

Better Management Avoids Replication: Better management results from the work of specialists within the central administration and the exchange of expertise among campuses. Millett defines wasteful duplication among campuses as replication and elimination of this is a major goal. Duplication that does not increase the unit cost is not wasteful and is not within the definition of replication. Few central program planning officers have given enough attention to differentiating between replication and duplication. In fact, fewer than half of the systems visited have a cabinet level central officer with program planning as his primary duty. In the rapidly expanding sixties funds were available for almost any program proposed, but the seventies will be drastically different and each new program probably will be achieved only by eliminating or reducing an existing one. Overall program planning will be much more important to the future management of university systems than in the past.

Although federal agencies usually desire to work at the "performing level" on each campus, a very large proposal is often stronger if it has the backing of an integrated faculty team from the several campuses of the system. This can be achieved if campus executives and deans support the efforts which often require the catalytic action of the principal academic affairs officer of the system.

Expensive support equipment is located on the campus where it can serve a wide spectrum of interests, and made available to students and faculty from other campuses. The potential for achieving this coordination and avoiding replication is indeed a strong argument for the multicampus system.

For quality at the advanced graduate level in any given field, a single campus institution requires a broad cross section of talent. A multicampus system can plan to have the same total talent, or more, but allocate this among the campuses on an academically planned subdiscipline basis. In this way, each campus of the system has a strong component to support the campus mission, but overall strength comes at a lower cost from the combined talent of the system. Achieving this requires good in-depth planning and also surveillance. For recommendations to the system executive, the latter would seem to be the duty of the principal academic affairs officer of the central system, and the former that of the central program planning officer who is knowledgeable of the state's needs and campus strengths.

If a new campus is suggested in a state the program planning officer of the system should have the expertise to provide for the system executive sound recommendations on state and regional needs and serious deterrents to other campuses without political overtones. This officer would recommend new programs for an existing campus, or establishing a new campus, only if there are strong unmet public needs in areas under consideration. The principal academic affairs officer of the central staff may recommend to the system executive expansion of a program for academic reasons only. Then the system executive would have to weigh the merits of the possible conflicting recommendations from two of his executive officers arising from different bases of need. Most administrators would agree that in the past, too many program expansions have been made without clear evidence of public need and in these days of austere budgets, the system's ability for the assessment of public need for a new or expanded academic program should be given a higher priority than in the past. An assessment of need often may prove desirable the deferrment of a program proposed by a campus faculty and approved by the principal academic affairs officer. On the other hand, the concern of the academic affairs officer for program shifts to improve quality should not be passed over lightly as internal quality improvement should be a continuing process even in times of austerity.

Directors of institutional research and cost analysts do not always recognize the spin-off value of funding for the research component of graduate education. A very high percentage of the cost of graduate education results from the reduced teaching loads of graduate faculty members. This reduced teaching load enables these faculty members to conduct research and direct advanced graduate students simultaneously. A university's position with legislators and coordinating agencies would be improved by an accounting system showing the allocation of these costs between the two functions. For a research university the added cost of doctoral programs, above the cost of obligatory research, can be confusing to nonacademic people. The total cost of research is more than doctoral programs require, but doctoral programs are interlocked with research efforts. The amount of outside funds for research and extension attracted because of activities of faculty from reduced resident teaching loads should be computed and disseminated. The University of Illinois has given emphasis to this in the justification of budget requests to the Board of Higher Education and State Legislature with a good response.

The Benefits of the Unified Budget for Multicampus Universities: The unified budget of the system, based on educational needs of the state, eliminates the political logrolling that usually exists among competing independent institutions. The budget of the system should reflect good academic planning, values of the university system to the state and reasonable levels of quality. The system must be more than an accountant for appropriated funds; it must account for their effective utilization. Although much improvement is yet to be realized, many systems have gained such confidence of outsiders that they have ordered their budgetary request to meet priority needs of resident teaching, research and public service.

Internally a better understanding is needed between the campus and central staffs on establishment of priorities, but the external acceptance of the central unified budget is widely supported by educators. The unified budget does foster diversity, specialization and cooperation. Even those campus executives who are not always happy with their share of the budget most often believe the system's division, executive and board, is much better than if allocations were made directly by the legislature or by a coordinating agency.

Federal funds, although a significant component of most campus budgets, are omitted from the present discussion since this subject can be treated better under a future section on internal planning. Most federal money comes in small packages and not many block grants are large enough to require the direct involvement of the system executive and his central staff; the exception is long-range salary obligations.

The multicampus system should have the best expertise for budgeting of any group in the state, and by making full use of this capability, degrading questions by decision makers at the state level should be avoided, or at least alleviated. Most systems should review and upgrade internal budgeting methods as the inherent advantages of the well constructed unified budget are not always realized. Internal allocations to many categories can best be met by formula, but others are not adaptable to formula analyses.

Academic Program Planning Capabilities: A land-grant university must study and plan how it is to distribute its available resources, however adequate they may be, among three important functions: (a) extension, (b) research and (c) resident instruction. To arrive at this decision the system executive can make use of the expertise of his campus executives, his principal academic affairs officer for an internal review and of his principal program planning officer for an external evaluation. Extension and research activities distinctly separate a university from a state college, but the policies on allocation of scarce funds must not neglect resident instruction. If neglected, the university would erode to a weak resident teaching entity. The needs of the taxpaying public must be considered in this tri-part allocation.

For a multicampus system made up of institutions with similar goals and academic levels, but diverse program scopes, such as (a) group of research and extension universities or (b) group of teaching universities only, cost analysis data should be comparable among the several counterpart components of each system. When a system has institutions with widely different objectives such as now exists in Wisconsin, North Carolina, New York and Georgia, a decision has to be made of the different roles of the system's components and equity defined as something other than equality.

The system executive and his chief academic, business-finance and program planning officers have, for this type of system, a much more complex job of assessment and evaluation than for a system of similar institutions. The central academic affairs officer may argue that these decisions should be limited to internal factors only, but for a member campus which has its goals drastically curtailed, those being served by it externally will be concerned and their interests should be heard through an officer cognizant of their needs.

The academic affairs, the chief business-finance and the program planning officers of the central staff must review cost data and institutional research data with caution when used for comparative purposes. Departments, colleges or institutions can always spend all of the money made available to them and higher cost programs in similar fields do not necessarily achieve better academic quality or offer better service to the state.

The Carnegie Commission alerts us to the reality that new resources will not be great and all institutions must plan on how they can reallocate to serve the public better and improve academic quality.[18]

The Carnegie Commission reports find:

> "Stagflation" is a very poor environment for both the income and the costs of higher education. Also higher education may be reaching a ceiling in the amount of money it can expect from society—it used about 1 percent of the GNP in 1960 and is using 2.5 percent now, and no other segment of society more than doubled its take of the GNP during that short period of time. A resistance point may have been reached.[19]

Much is said about the value of statewide planning in justifying coordinating agencies. This writer maintains that the only good statewide plans are those that originate at campuses within the university system and are evaluated for gaps and overlaps by the system; then they are checked by an objective coordinating commission at the state level. The multicampus university is expected to have much power in the state and if it pursues and reviews its plans diligently, most elements would be accepted by the unbiased review at the state level. Budget and facilities planning should await the studies for the academic plan of each campus. Lee and Bowen suggest that campus planning is good defense against forced external planning and budgeting.

> External planning and review functions can be, and often are, exercised by state authorities, both executive and legislative. However, the multicampus university—in common with all other universities—is based on the assumption that the widest possible range of educational decisions should be separated from the explicitly political arms of the state.[20]

Millett observes that, except at the department or professional school levels, almost all institutions have been too lax in academic planning.[21]

The Carnegie Commission cites the evaluating and review process of planning:

> Intermediate and long-range planning raises questions about the continuing validity of the assumptions on which the planning is based. It is imperative, therefore, that the mechanisms for planning provide for frequent reviews and evaluations of progress.[22]

The Carnegie Commission also recommends elements for state planning:

> Present and future access to postsecondary education, including need for student spaces, student financial aid programs, geographic availability of institutions, and admission standards for types of institutions.
>
> Appropriate functions for the various types of institutions within postsecondary education, including degrees to be granted, research activities, and public service functions.

> Orderly growth of postsecondary education—including location of new campuses, development of new schools, and optimum size of institutions.
>
> Articulation among the various elements of postsecondary education and within secondary education.[23]

With these general guidelines the multicampus university should be in an excellent position to formulate its specific academic and program plan without danger of outright conflict when it is reviewed at the commission or other state levels. The system must have planned programs of quality which will gain the confidence of the public, statewide coordinating agencies, legislatures and designed to serve local and statewide needs.

What Planning Can Accomplish: The potential role of the success of academic planning is exemplified by the planner's ability to study long-range program needs. Overcommitment should be avoided by the program planning officer in his recommendations to the system executive. The More Effective Uses of Resources speaks to this:

> Some institutions become overcommitted in the euphoria of growth; they tried to move up too far and to fast in the academic world in relation to their available resources. The number of institutions giving the Ph.D. degree, for example, increased from 180 to 250. Many campuses found it hard to slow their growth and slow their expectations as the period of rapid expansion ended.
>
> Even now, about 70 communities plan to start new medical schools when the nation requires only about 10 percent of this number; and about 150 college and universities plan to introduce Ph.D. programs for the first time when no more at all are needed. The momentum is there and it is hard to slow it down.[24]

Clark Kerr summarizes the objective of the system for planning as follows:

> It facilitates long-range and overall planning of the creation of new places for students, of the provision of new services to new areas of the state, of the assignment of new endeavors among campuses, and of the continuing differentiation of functions between and among campuses.

Planning For The Multicampus System: Lee and Bowen set the stage for this section by pointing out the neglect of program planning by most multicampus systems:

> There is some indication that the central administrators of the multicampus universities occassionally welcome planning requirements set by the coordinating agency as an "excuse" to encourage plans by the campuses.
>
> A potential advantage of the multicampus university as a governing and not merely a coordinating agency is that academic planning can be more closely integrated with both physical planning and the operating budget. Examples of fruitful interrelationships were found, but none of the systems claim successful meshing of the three activities. While this undoubtedly reflects parallel diffusion of authority at state and federal levels, there is also an internal reason: academic planning in the multicampus university is characterized by inadequate staffing.[27]

This writer believes that *physical* planning by the business and finance officer is relatively straightforward after it is decided which departments and research units are to exist on each campus, and the priority of each. The physical assessment then answers the questions: (a) which ones have adequate facilities, (b) which ones can be served by renovated facilities and (c) which ones require new facilities and quantity of space? "Persons with formal planning duties frequently spend most of their time putting out fires. Long-range planning tends to be deferred."[28]

A system will have great difficulty in achieving diversity, specialization and cooperation among campuses without the best possible program planning. Without program planning followed by compatable budget and facility planning, the system is no more than a collection of campuses which invites the state capital or coordinating agency to take over.

The central administration needs an adequate program planning staff but this should be supplemented by temporary academic representatives from the campuses. However, the central staff should establish general guidelines and maintain schedules. Lee and Bowen further emphasize the importance of planning, "The success of the multicampus university is measured by the effectiveness of universitywide academic planning and program review."[29] The multicampus university is in an ideal position to set academic standards and enforce compliance because of its ability for diversity, specialization and cooperation.

Internal planning is not only important to state agencies, but also to the public as described by Richard E. Peterson in The Organized Organization. Peterson proposes a university program planning group comprised of a permanent staff and a relating staff of faculty and students. He also proposes a large regional research group, with both permanent and relating staffs, that would routinely gather information about the region of relevance to the work of the university system.[30]

The Carnegie Commission speaks to coordination and planning:

> The basic impetus for coordination of educational units was the desire to avoid multiple budget negotiations between several separate institutions and the state legislature and to avoid competition that might be harmful to the system as a whole and to the units within it.
>
> Planning, on the other hand, grew out of broader and more long-range concerns. In its broadest sense, statewide planning must first be concerned with sets of goals: the economic and social goals of the state, the goals of the edu-

> cational system and its institutions, the goals of the individuals within the system, and the interaction among these sets of goals. Then planning must be addressed to the optimum allocation of resources to accomplish the desired ends.
>
> Many states have resorted to overall educational consolidation and planning because of competition and duplication among institutions. States are more sensitive to the public commitment to equality of educational opportunity than the campuses themselves.[31]

Knowing the goals of coordinating agencies can give the multicampus system guidance for its own planning to avoid a direct confrontation with a coordinating agency. The Carnegie Commission gives planning as motivating reasons for coordinating agencies:

> Regardless of the form the coordinating agencies take, they are usually established to achieve the following:
>
> - Avoid wasteful duplication in programs and harmful competition for resources
> - Work toward greater efficiency in the use of scarce resources
> - Aid the orderly growth of all postsecondary facilities within the state, including consideration of locations for new campuses
> - Assist in developing state policy on admission of students to higher education
> - Serve as a communications agency among the postsecondary education community, the state government, and the public
> - Foster excellence in the development of the variety of programs involved in the expanding postsecondary education network
>
> Some states have been relatively successful in preventing duplication in the establishment of new programs, but relatively little success has been experienced in the elimination of existing [unproductive] duplication.[32]

These arguments support the role of the multicampus system not only to plan new programs but to assess the currency of existing programs and their importance to those being served by the system. No longer should the determination of appropriate programs for institutions be on an ad hoc basis at the time of budget review, but on a long-range plan revised annually.

Planning new graduate programs has unique characteristics because of cost and need. The central academic affairs officer should advise the system executive of the ability of the proposing department to offer the program and additional resources required. The officer responsible for program planning should make the external accessment of need. Most governing boards are very reluctant to approve new doctoral programs without thorough documentation because of the necessity to utilize resources effectively. Graduate programs are very important to departmental faculties of research level universities and the central academic affairs officer should communicate carefully with the campus graduate dean and the campus executive before making recommendations to the system executive. Graduate level universities must be clearly distinguished from other state institutions. For a multicampus system of campuses at a similar academic level a standard of performance among all campuses can be established. Achieving this is largely the responsibility of the central academic affairs officer and the campus executives. Graduate programs have to have a high priority in a research level university.

The general academic plan of most systems can be adequate for acceptance of governing boards and coordinating agencies, but these plans may be too general for defining operation. The internal plan should speak to details even to the distribution of students among campuses and programs. Physical planning, unfortunately, often leads program planning, and an early capital commitment may later prove overly adequate to meet academic and other program priorities. It is good to have faculty representation and campus officials on system level capital planning groups.

Program, physical and budget planning should mesh, but this often does not occur due to inadequate advanced and coordinated efforts in determining missions and goals.

Budgets below those needed and requested are expected in higher education, but in multicampus systems reductions often uproot carefully planned programs and order of capital priorities. This change is likely to affect some of the members of the family more severely than others, and morale is severly hurt.

To the question, does the multicampus university make a difference in planning? Lee and Bowen state:

> Since the multicampus universities, however, do control internal factors, inadequacies of planning can be traced in some instances to failures of leadership within the university and to inadequate staffs, many of which are far too small to meet system needs. Increased attention to the internal factors within system's control could counterbalance the external factors.[33]

The university is frequently placed in a defensive role by external viewers because the university is clear on what it does not want but not clear on what it does want. A fault with program planning in most systems is the protection of accepted values and traditions especially in academic areas, and a reluctance to be innovative. Lee and Bowen report that in terms of planned programs the multicampus university is not enough greater than the sum of its component campuses as its potential projects that it should be.[34]

Just as program planning is deficient, innovative budgeting and resource allocation at most multicampus universities have not been advantageous to the potential possible. More attention should be given to cooperative programs that build on the individual strengths of each campus and this should benefit the budget argument. Planning, budgeting and coordination are strong points of multicampus systems. Lee and Bowen believe that all nine of the systems in their study have to intensify long-range budget as well as program planning.[35] This should be initiated by the institutions and not forced by outside pressures. Edward H. Litchfield in Organization in Large American Universities states:

> In states where the governing board and coordinating board is the same, each institution is vulnerable to having a role assigned to it that may not be to its liking. Good long-range planning on the part of the institution can help alleviate this concern.[36]

This advice is believed applicable to every multicampus university also.

Baldridge in Organization in Large American Universities cites a case where New York University confronted by enrollment drops was forced into a concerted planning effort:

> It is clear that organizations change both because of the force of circumstances and because of the future-oriented plans that are made. In a real sense determining which approach causes change is a false question and the more interesting issue is how planning and the constraint of circumstances interact. In this case NYU was faced with a set of external events that threatened its very existence, and this hard necessity set off a chain of events in which future-oriented planning became a critical feature of the institution's response. Of course, it is conceivable that the university might not have responded in this manner, but could have muddled through, making ad hoc adjustments rather than bold plans. Thus necessity and the force of changing circumstances allow the possibility of creative planning, but do not always generate the reaction. The Marxian and Weberian insights contribute much to each other, for hard necessity and the future-oriented plans of men are almost jointly involved in the change processes of the real world.[37]

NYU served the needs of a broad cross section of students until new public institutions competed for students to the extent that NYU suffered a serious enrollment decrease. Much emphasis was given to planning to meet this enrollment drop and resulting financial crises. Programs were curtailed and the quality of students accepted was elevated. Services were by necessity decreased.[38]

The program planning, business-finance and academic affairs officers of the central staff all must have good institutional research data on which to make their recommendations to the system executive, but we are reminded by Rourke and Brooks that cost analysis techniques do not take quality into consideration. This should concern the central academic affairs officer especially.

Robert O. Berdahl in Statewide Coordination of Higher Education gives a vivid example of problems which central officers face:

> North Carolina made use of consultants from outside the state, to review new program proposals, while this valued the problem of objectivity, it raised another issue brought to our attention by a college president in that state. He noted that experts from high powered out of state institutions tended to have unrealistically high expectations and to judge modest local needs by Berkeley and Harvard standards.[39]

The multicampus central administration is a buffer between the external political forces and the everyday problems of the campuses, accordingly, planning can be made compatible. Program planning in the multicampus university includes (a) attempts to define goals and methods of reaching them, (b) specific program review of productivity, (c) cooperative programs among the various campuses of the system, and (c) service expected of the system by the public which finances it. Academic program planning and quality evaluation are valuable to all sectors of the system as well as to external interests. The struggle over priorities between internal and external forces can slow progress. A multicampus system has a better chance to achieve quality in its planning than if programs were determined by a coordinating agency, even the best of which likely will have to compromise because of political forces.

The system's ability to meet the needs of the state is enhanced by good planning. Obviously, support from the public and elected officials is essential for implementation of plans. The cyclic availability of federal funding is a serious deterrent to making and implementing plans and reaching goals. When the rate of growth of new funds is low or zero, inflation and fixed cost seriously deter the implementation of plans. Under these conditions reallocation of resources has to be made so that some forward progress can be achieved. Important goals of long-range planning include the prediction of inflation, level of support, student shifts and other important external factors. Faculty should have inputs to the various facets of planning, but especially when reallocations are being recommended. Lee and Bowen report that of the nine systems surveyed in 1968, program planning seemed inadequate, while they often stated that planning is a major potential advantage of a multicampus system.[40]

The Carnegie Commission notes the importance of reasonable class sizes in achieving efficiency. More important, however, is the problem of course proliferation:

> Few would argue that our colleges and universities are models of efficiency. Examples of apparent inefficiencies are not difficult to find. Perhaps the most obvious and also enduring example is the continuing proliferation of courses. In 1957 the Presidents' Committee on Education Beyond the High School, concerned with the proliferation of courses, urged that all faculties "earnestly and periodically review their own curricula in the light of the students' educational needs, major objectives and institutional resources."[41]

This writer feels that the problem should be tackled first by the academic affairs officer of the system and the campus executive rather than by the faculty, other local officers or system executive. However, the system executive should give this effort his support and be a catalyst since he will make final decisions on resource allocations. Lee and Bowen reported poor planning involving a system executive who let simultaneous proposals for similar graduate programs from two campuses reach the board at the same meeting. The board reacted negatively and questioned the scrutiny of the central officers.[42]

Lee and Bowen present a challenge to the central program planning, business-finance, academic affairs officers and the system executive:

> ...the multicampus universities have promoted among existing campuses specialization, diversity, and cooperation in academic planning and in the preparation and implementation of the budget. Examples abound of difficult decisions to assign a particular high-cost program to one campus, to defer a program at another, to develop complementary programs among several. It is difficult to imagine these decisions being reached on a voluntary basis among autonomous institutions; it is also difficult to conceive of equally effective resource allocation being made by persons in coordinating agencies or state government, removed, as they are, from operating responsibilities.[43]

As disciplines and subdisciplines increase, campuses will specialize more and students will have to be distributed on the basis of the speciality of study they desire rather than the geographic location they prefer. Members of the central staff serve as catalysts and coordinators; they encourage diversity and enforce specialization. The central academic affairs officer promotes intercampus cooperation for activities and programs not possible for a single campus alone. Costs analyses and institutional research data are important tools to all central officers as they have to interpret the statistical data provided them to document their recommendations to the system executive.

The length of this section speaks to the need for a greater emphasis on planning programs (including academic), budgeting and resource allocations for multicampus systems; initiation by the institutions has much merit in contrast to responding to external requests.

Multicampus Structure Improves External Relations: The stronger voices of the multicampus officers, especially the system executive, is a benefit to good public relations. Each campus makes its particular contribution but the added impact of the system is noteworthy. Within a system the established reputation of older campuses is a valuable asset to faculty recruitment at the new or developing campus.

A highly specialized professor on one campus may enhance other campuses by teaching or holding seminars at prescribed intervals on campuses away from his home base. Academic programing is also important in managing personnel mobility among campuses. Nonacademic and sometimes faculty personnel may want to transfer from one campus to another and the unified personnel plan of the multicampus readily permits this. The comprehensive multicampus system or the statewide one board system has a problem in deliberately hiring top faculty members for selected research level campuses and lower paid ones at others. No state can afford to have large numbers of top ranking specialized faculty at every institution within its boundaries and an appropriate categorization of campuses by level is a very important element of the central management. Those at the same level should have diversified program scopes in professional and graduate programs.

These characteristics of the multicampus system are important to academic quality but external interests will recognize them favorably as methods to offer service and better utilize resources. Systems must do more to demonstrate to the public that they desire high quality, but also have a conscience in using public funds.

A multicampus system also permits students to transfer among campuses to take advantage of a special professor or a unique piece of equipment. Not only does the student have a choice of campuses when he enters, but opportunity for temporary or permanent transfer should always be open to him.

A multicampus system has the capability, and should exercise it, that permits transfer of students after two years from one campus to another in the same field as a routine matter. On the other hand, admission requirements at the freshman level may vary. These variations can help distribute students more uniformly among the campuses of the system; Lee and Bowen found most multicampus systems failed to distribute students efficiently among the campuses. Such failure gives coordinating agencies leverage to work to the detriment of the system. Good forecast of future needs by the system is the best protection against outside dictates. To the external interests of the university, better utilization of faculty, more services to students and examples of monetary savings to the university and especially to the students are very important. Most systems have not taken full advantage of these potentials in practice and if they have, not enough has been said about them publicly.

Cooperation Encourages Systemwide Programs: Another strong point of a multicampus system is its ability to pool resources so that the total achievement is more than the sum of the components. A research team on one campus with good equipment for a special area of research should solicit the cooperation of faculty talent from other campuses. These additions should enhance the opportunity for outside funding and also make it unnecessary to duplicate the same equipment on other campuses. Although this kind of cooperation should be spontaneous, it often requires that a ranking member of the central staff serve as a catalyst. For programs not involving equipment, but human talent only, initiative from the central administration is the best way to launch systemwide programs.

One area in which system coordination can improve university programs is student services. The Carnegie Commission makes an important recommendation relating to student services:

> The Commission recommends that colleges and universities review their student services, with particular reference to reducing the extent of subsidization of these services where it seems justified. However, in view of the critical need for counseling services for disadvantaged students, the changes that are occuring in patterns of participation in higher education, and the complex shifts that are taking place in the labor market for college graduates, we believe that counseling services will need to be expanded rather than contracted in many colleges and universities.[44]

As a simple example, if arrangments for touring cultural programs or prominent speakers were made by the central administration, in contrast to each campus, better programs are likely and more students will benefit from an equal expenditure of funds.

Promotion, tenure and salary administration are largely delegated to the campuses, but at the central staff the chief academic affairs officer has to establish rather detailed guidelines to assure quality and the integrity of rank. Similar institutions in the same system should not have wide variations in the quality of personnel performing similar duties. A post audit of these decisions at the campus level by the central office improves mutual understandings between the central administration and the campuses.

Lee and Bowen state quality of faculty as one of the major strengths of the multicampus system:

> If the multicampus system makes a positive contribution to the quality of faculty found on each campus, it may be said to be a success, regardless of other shortcomings. If it makes little or no difference, then one of the main reasons for the system's existence can be questioned.[45]

Chapter 5

QUALIFYING NOTES: LIMITATION OF THE MULTICAMPUS UNIVERSITY

Introduction: Many references have been cited of the advantages or potential advantages of multicampus or one board systems in contrast to competing independently managed institutions. Campus visits fully document these advantages, but in the real world almost all gains are partially offset by losses. An objective observer would be incomplete in his analyses if the inherent disadvantages of multicampus systems were brushed aside. In some systems, the structure and quality of management makes the difference whether or not the potential advantages are realized to the extent necessary to offset, by a significant margin, the unavoidable liabilities of the system.

The Inherent Liabilities of the Multicampus System: No system is all good or all bad and this section describes some of the liabilities. As Clark Kerr suggests, the basic disadvantages of multicampus organization result from increasing bureaucracy which accompanies increasing size and more layers of management.

> With its extra layer of management, it is almost inevitably more bureacratic, more slow to move; it is less collegial in management and less personal in approach.[46]

The power shift away from the campus may result in campus elements viewing the university as an absentee landlord.

> Faculty senates and student governments have less influence. Both operate best on immediate, local, individual problems. It is the central expert who sees better

> and often analyzes better the more general and long-run problems. As a consequence, faculty unionization and student confrontation against the distant experts may be encouraged in lieu of more informal participation in decision making.[47]
>
> The lay board of the system is farther removed from the local atmosphere of the campus and the current practicalities of relationships. It is, as a consequence, more likely to react ideologically to problems, to respond to the personal whims of influential members and to current headlines, and to be concerned with external considerations. It is harder for even the best of boards to perform as well as it could if it were concerned only with a single campus with which its members are closely identified and intimately knowledgeable.[48]

Systemwide planning is less viable in internal politics than a more individualistic approach.

> The very process of centralized planning results in denying many expectations to many people at the same moment through the plan, as compared with case by case action where "gifts" are made to many over a period of time and denials take the form of individual postponements for later consideration. The case by case approach may be less rigorously thoughtful, but is is more adaptably politic.[49]

In its external relationships the multicampus university is subject to unusual problems concerning the standing of one campus as it affects the university. An equally important external problem is the possibility of a biased and disagreeable state governor serving on the board.

> The political impact of an untoward event on a single campus can affect the whole rather than being isolated on the one campus; but, conversely, the whole system may protect the single campus from political retaliation - it is harder to get at and punish the particular campus.
>
> The multicampus system is more open to control by external authority, particularly by governors, than would be a series of separate

> campuses. Among other reasons, a governor can be effective on one board in a way he could not be on 10 or 20 or 50 campus boards.[50]

One serious problem that occurs in systems of dissimilar campuses is determining the negotiating unit for collective bargaining if this is an issue. The governing board would like to consider the system as the unit, but how do the administrators sustain quality of faculty in a research level university if they are in the same unit as a two-year college or weaker four-year colleges?

The Carnegie Commission in Governance of Higher Education has a proposed solution but only experience will show its applicability.

> Thus, if formal collective bargaining is to be undertaken at all, we favor a combination of codetermination for academic affairs and collective bargaining for economic matters, with the senate sharing certain managerial functions, and the union handling adversary functions. Recommendation 18: The approach to contract coverage should be one of restraint with the contract covering economic benefits and with academic affairs left (or put) in the hands of the faculty senate or equivalent council.[51]

Finally, operational difficulties between central staffs and campus administrations often result because of the many possible areas of friction. In the judgement of this writer, however, these inherent disadvantages are overcome manyfold by advantages, provided that management makes full use of the potential of the multicampus system. Let's assume that the governor will favor the university if the system executive presents his justifications well.

Special Problems of Multicampus Systems: The dangers of rigidity on the basis of uniform system policy often can present a specific problem for any one campus which tends to hurt the student and the faculty. On the more prestigious campuses of a multicampus system, faculty often do not look with favor as being members of the system. They argue that the new campuses erode their prestige, reduce their financial support and sometimes take faculty from the developed campuses to the new campuses.

Multicampus systems have reported problems in the administration of medical schools, agricultural experiment stations and continuing education. In several systems a senior level central officer with line authority assists in administering these. These persons then have more than a single campus responsibility and mix line and staff functions. A central officer for these functions would not likely exist unless these units were important on more than one campus. Their existence is viewed by those in other fields on the campuses as line officers and concern arises that the central administration will assign line duties to other central officers, thereby moving certain functions from the campuses to the central administration.

From the references and observations of this study, it appears that every campus, within a system, must have restraints if efficiency is to be achieved. However, academic quality and identity dictate that each campus must have a critical mass of programs that are mutually supporting. At the undergraduate level, and often at the masters level, a wide range of arts and sciences courses are needed as a core for quality. These are not inefficient as students are available to populate them. This core program also serves the local and regional geographic areas of the campus for postsecondary and baccalaureate requirements.

Professional schools have to be distributed among campuses but at the research level university, each of the professional schools chosen for a campus should offer the highest degree of the profession. Graduate level courses in arts and sciences must be selected to serve the professional programs of the campus, and this inherently limits the scope of programs. However, the number of advanced arts and science courses needed to serve effectively the professional schools will be adequate for offering advanced degrees in these fields at a very low incremental cost, or almost as a bonus. Taking advantage of this opportunity enhances the quality of the campus and each campus will be an academically integrated unit. The distribution of programs among campuses restricts the scope of each, but a planned integration of programs can provide a complete, although not comprehensive, campus of the highest quality.

SECTION SUMMARY

The multicampus university, in concept, can respond to the realities of the day and many systems have demonstrated this. During the sixties the evolution of the multicampus system has been described as one of the most important developments in higher education in the past quarter of a century. The multicampus university has more flexibility than a group of independent universities and can respond more readily to external pressures without a significant loss of academic freedom or any loss in quality of education.

The multicampus universities are coordinators of programs and are a move toward integrated management and coordination of institutions. However, the multicampus system enables a wide latitude of autonomy of its campuses and protects the campuses with local freedom not possible in the national universities of Europe.

Almost all states have resorted to more authorative coordination with the theory of avoiding competition among institutions that results in replication of programs. Achieving better utilization of resources and bringing education closer to all of the state's population are also objectives. The multicampus movement is the educators' view of how the objectives of the state can be achieved without control of the institutions by powerful coordinating agencies or directly by state agencies and the legislature.

A few public independent institutions still exist in some states, but a significant increase has been noted in each of the following:

1. Multicampus systems with one board and one system executive through whom all campus executives of the system report.
2. A statewide board with a state executive through whom all campuses report. (Two year colleges are included in some states but omitted in others.)
3. A statewide board to which each campus executive reports without the intermediary of a statewide executive.

Multicampus systems are often comprised of institutions at similar academic levels where others have a wide variation in the academic range of the component institutions. A multicampus system of diverse institutions seems to have few differences from a statewide single board system with a central executive. Similarity is noted in the type of administrative structure required for effective management.

Although segmented multicampus systems are comprised of campuses with similar academic levels and goals, diversity, specialization of program and cooperation are advocated among campuses to achieve the potential value of the multicampus concept to serve the state. The central administration must have a staff in functional areas to develop recommendations for policies to achieve these objectives and also the capabilities to enforce policies. Most predominantly operational activities are delegated to the campuses in a university system if its full potentials are to be realized.

The central administration and campus administration share the work load and the cost of management, due to coordination and economy of scale, is less than for a series of independent campuses. Quality can be enhanced on each campus if the system concentrates resources in the planned mission areas of each campus, yet the combined strength of each can be more than the total of an equal number of independent campuses. This is possible because of the orderly ability to pool the resources of each campus to gain outstanding strength for the system. Both high level faculty and administrative expertise can be built into the system that would be prohibitively expensive to achieve on a single independent campus.

The multicampus system can serve more students— and at a higher quality— by offering them a place at another location if the campus of their first choice is full, and by offering expensive and low demand programs on only one or two campuses of the system. The system not only provides the flexibility for each campus to specialize academically, but also permits innovative administrative structures at the campus level.

The multicampus system has proven in many states to be a mutually beneficial buffer between educational institutions and state agencies with the result of better service to the public. The allocation of resources among campuses by an enlightened board and a properly structured and qualified central administration more nearly achieves equitable funding than if each campus received a direct line item appropriation from the state through competitive political practices. The multicampus system brings together political and public interests in each campus to focus onto the total needs of higher education in an orderly planned way.

Not only can member institutions of the multicampus system share human resources, administrators and faculty, but also high cost facilities. This ability to share not only enhances the quality of research and graduate education at planned research level institutions, but also reduces the cost of advanced graduate and professional academic programs.

The central staff of the system, the executive or one of his cabinet level officers, is required to touch base with federal agencies to study and forecast the impact of changing national policies on the university. Desired professional contacts can be delegated to the campuses so that they can operate in the way that best meets their needs for obtaining outside funding for academic projects.

Program planning was not thought to be very important in the expanding sixties during which a need for many new programs existed and funds were available to launch them. The seventies are different because of changes in public needs and limited resources to start new programs. A program planning officer with in-depth academic experience and the ability to assess external need is believed necessary to fill an important central function to cope with the planning requirements during the seventies, and probably the eighties. Planning will be a continuing process because of changing needs of the public served by the university and the necessity to curtail or eliminate old programs in order to offer newer ones of higher priority. Planning should be initiated and assessed at the university level for the later review by a coordinating commission or other state agency, rather than the reverse route in which the university has to react to demands from outside agencies. Initiation by the campus, and review by the system, is the positive approach, while reaction to an external plan places the university in a defensive role. The multicampus university has the flexibility to meet changes forecast by good planning.

Budget planning and projection of physical facilities must await an agreement by the system executive and board on academic plans and other functional programs. Describing goals and program planning eliminates the dangers of institutional overcommitment which, if financial resources are inadequate, can seriously injure quality. Planning the budget requires the close cooperation of program planning, business-finance and academic expertise of the central system in order to give the system executive the most defensible arguments for the best possible service to the public benefiting from the university. A single budget is a strong characteristic of a multicampus system. Faculty input is needed for program planning and budget preparation, along with the recommendations of campus executives and their key personnel, for the central staff to fulfill its role effectively.

Plans for external information can be more general than the detailed ones needed for internal communication and program implementation. Good planning should enable better specialization among campuses, but also it should improve quality of the campuses and the total system. Good advanced planning can be a fortress for defense against external attack and can give the campuses and system a solid foundation for coping with unanticipated problems. Course prolification is a result of poor planning since academic costs are much more directly related to the cost of courses offered than to degree programs provided.

The multicampus system has the ability to demonstrate better public service, and accordingly improve external support, through its efforts to achieve diversity, specialization and cooperation among components. Simple actions such as freedom of students to transfer routinely among campuses builds good public relations for the system. Systemwide programs involving two or more campuses are looked upon favorably by the taxpaying public and state legislators.

The multicampus system has the inherent disadvantage of moving some important decisions further away from the campus faculty, deans and the campus executive. Its many potential advantages in coping with the problems of the seventies can greatly offset these obvious deterrents. These disadvantages can be minimized through an adequate administrative structure.

The multicampus system has the potential capability to cope with the major external confrontations of the seventies and protect the integrity, identity and visibility of each campus. Some systems are more adequately achieving this potential than others. The most important efforts of the board and system executive to achieve the maximum potential of the system are believed to be the following: (a) good internal and external communications, (b) good planning to sustain quality, to serve the external public and to achieve internal specialization to use resources better and (c) an effective administrative structure that can provide sound recommendations to the system executive in important basic functional areas.

All campuses should have a sufficient base of undergraduate programs to achieve the critical mass for quality. Professional schools, with few exceptions, will have to be distributed among the campuses. For a research level university, however, the professional programs chosen for each campus should offer the highest degree of the profession. Degree programs at the doctoral level in arts and sciences may be offered at low incremental cost for those areas closely related to the professional schools on each campus. If advanced level arts and science courses are chosen to closely relate to the professional efforts of each campus, high quality and program integration can be achieved. Limiting program scope on each campus seems to many to be a deficiency of a system but this can be an opportunity for higher quality in the areas chosen and demonstrates to the taxpayer effective utilization of resources.

References

[1] Lee and Bowen, p. xii.

[2] *Ibid.*, p.l.

[3] J. Victor Baldridge, *Academic Governance*, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1971), p. 169.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. iv.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[7] Lee and Bowen, pp. xi-xii.

[8] Epstein, p. 39.

[9] Lee and Bowen, p. xii.

[10] *Ibid*.

[11] *Ibid*., pp. 66-67.

[12] *Ibid*.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. xiv-xv.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

[16] Epstein, p. 56 and 57

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 66 and 67.

[18] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The More Effective Uses of Resources* (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972)

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

[20] Lee and Bowen, p. 217.

[21] Millett, p.

[22] Carnegie Commission, Capitol, p. 36.

[23] Ibid., p. 34.

[24] Carnegie Commission, Effective Uses of Resources, p. 2.

[25] Lee and Bowen, p. xii.

[26] Ibid., p. 59.

[27] Ibid., p. 232.

[28] Ibid.,

[29] Ibid., p. 215.

[30] Richard E. Perry and Frank W. Hull, IV, The Organized Organization: The American University and its Administration (The University of Toledo, 1971),

[31] Carengie Commission, Capitol, p. 31.

[32] Ibid., p. 26.

[33] Lee and Bowen, p. 31.

[34] Ibid.,

[35] Ibid.,

[36] Baldridge, Academic Governance, pp. 208-231.

[37] Ibid.,

[38] Ibid., pp. 208-231.

[39] Berdahl, Statewide Coordination,

[40] Lee and Bowen,

[41] Carnegie Commission, Effective Uses of Resources, p. 67.

[42] Lee and Bowen,

[43] Ibid., p. 416.

[44] Carnegie Commission, Effective Uses of Resources, p. 142.

[45] Lee and Bowen, p. 393.

[46] Lee and Bowen, p. xii.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. xii-xiv.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

[49] *Ibid.*,

[50] *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

[51] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 49.

Section III. Incarnating the Concept: Internal Governance of the Multicampus University

Chapter 6

THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF ADMINISTRATION AT THE SYSTEM LEVEL

Introduction: The previous sections have dealt primarily with the management of the multicampus university, its advantages, disadvantages and influential external forces. This section deals with the internal governance and management necessary for the multicampus university to achieve the goals and potentials described in the first sections. In this section reference to multicampus systems can also be applied to consolidated systems unless otherwise specified; a consolidated system is "multicampus."

To achieve its projected potentials, the basic administrative structure must have these elements:

1. An enlightened governing board representing a cross section of the public which the multicampus university is to serve.
2. A central executive with strong educational and managerial leadership ability.
3. An adequate front line staff for the central executive in quality and number to cover each functional area.
4. Shared responsibilities between the central executive and his staff with the campus executive and his staff.
5. Faculty, student and alumni involvement.

Role of the Governing Board: The system executive and his front line staff must perform research, make evaluations and offer recommendations so that the board can have the best possible foundation for its decisions. An inadequate central staff not only reduces the effectiveness of the central executive, but also the board. Lee and Bowen state that boards should be concerned with policy and depend on the administration to manage the system to implement established policies and to achieve goals. These authors also report that the front line staff of the system executive of the nine systems which they studied were usually too limited in numbers to serve adequately the chief executive and the board. Boards of multicampus systems must be concerned with the difficult tasks of overseeing planning, coordinating and evaluating.

Lee and Bowen believe that a serious need is for the board to become concerned with systemwide matters—by promoting and evaluating the diversity, specialization and cooperation of educational programs among campuses for which the multicampus university is uniquely qualified.[1] These authors remind us that a problem with many governing boards is that some members think in terms of the flagship campus as it used to be rather than the new entity of the multicampus system.

Boards have lost some authority in recent years to outside agencies and to faculty, but they continue to be charged with the coordination and governance of the system. In a multicampus system approval of a new program is more complex than for a single campus; not only do board members have to weigh the merits of the proposal, but also maintain the proper mission for each campus.

Epstein states the expectation of the faculty of the board's service to the university:

> The academic community, however, does want regents to champion its institutional interests. This expectation is most explicitly that of administrators, but it is shared implicitly by faculty and probably by students too. No one in the university community is at all likely to object when regents, collectively and individually, defend the university in general and its budget requests in particular. Trusteeship in this sense is happily legitimized within the university. It means, in Clark Kerr's language, that

> regents represent the university to the public, rather than the public to the university.[2]

The Carnegie Commission states:

> Governing boards, often considered a form of coordination although not strictly within the definition, generally have more power than coordinating agencies and thus need not rely to the same extent on persuasion. While an effective governing agency must be responsive to the individual interests of its units, to the extent that it controls budget and personnel selection, it usually has the added dimension of helping to shape those interests.[3]

Governing boards can be very helpful to the system executive in establishing cooperative relationships with coordinating agencies and also his interactions with the governor and key members of the legislature. To achieve these advantages the board has to demonstrate that the system executive and campus executives are working to utilize resources in an optimum way and are coordinating programs.

Some campuses of multicampus systems each have a "local board" with limited authority. The campus executives may feel that these have some value to them, but it would seem that a faculty group might be in a better position to offer advice, if giving advice is the purpose of the local boards. However, these local boards can have a value in attracting the attention of more influential citizens to become knowledgeable of and interested in the university.

An intricate relationship often develops between a state coordinating agency and the board of a multicampus system. The Carnegie Commission expresses a strong conviction that:

> ...creation of single governing boards [for the entire state] or establishment of coordinating agencies with administrative responsibilities results in centralized detailed control leading ultimately to rigidity and conformity. Also unneces-

> sary layering of authority means that similar processes are carried out at successive layers, and each decision affecting the operation of an institution takes longer and is more remote from the functioning level.[4]

Better relationships can be developed between the system and state coordinating agency if the central administration and board demonstrates cooperation on all but critical issues, such as attempts of outside agencies to intervene with the internal affairs of the institution. However, on critical issues of this magnitude, the administration and board of the multicampus system have to oppose the coordinating agency.

Although obvious to experienced educators, the Carnegie Commission's views of essentials for an effective university can be helpful to outside interests:

> A reasonable degree of independence from state and federal control
>
> Institutional separation from partisan political activity
>
> Essential academic freedom for faculty members and students
>
> Essential faculty influence over academic affairs
>
> Availability of many options from among which students may choose in selecting their campuses, their periods of attendance, their fields of study, and their courses
>
> Diversity among institutions
>
> Adaptability to changing circumstances
>
> A reasonable degree of consent within the campus
>
> A reasonable degree of public support externally[5]

Epstein speaks as a faculty member of the protection from external pressure expected of the governing board:

> Whatever can be made of the regents' power to establish the administrative structure, it is a power that university administrators and faculty members surely prefer to having regents make administrative decisions or any policies transmitted by outside pres-

> sures. As noted earlier, the internal university view is that regents should resist rather than transmit such pressures.[6]

The Carnegie Commission's view of how the board can best serve the multicampus system is:

> It acts as a "buffer" between society and the campus, resisting improper external interference and introducing a necessary contact with the changing realities of the surrounding society; it is the principal gatekeeper for the campus, and its judgment about what is improper interference on the one hand, and what is constructive adjustment on the other, is of the utmost importance to the conduct of the institution.[7]

It is clear from many references that experienced authorities believe the board of a multicampus system should be concerned with policy and not managerial details. It is generally reported that the board requires a large amount of the system executive's time. This is to be expected since the system executive is the interface between the board and university administrators. Rather than having a vice-president staff a board committee, "a better solution suggests having a limited number of board committees whose meetings are held at intervals scheduled to permit the president [system executive] to attend."[8] Most governing boards have very limited staffs and depend on the office of the system executive for this service.

> Another way of putting this point is to say that regents do not have any appreciable staff of their own. At the University of Wisconsin, for example, regents have a professional employee as their secretary, and he has a few clerical and secretarial assistants. Otherwise, in all financial, personnel, planning, and construction matters, regents depend for data and analysis on administrative officers serving under the president. Other universities, as far as I know, vary only slightly from this pattern, in which the board has no separate service from that of the university itself.[9]

> Although a separate administrative service for regents is not thereby created, the multicampus president and his staff become a "central administration" as distinct from the several campus administrations. It might in time come to look upon itself, and be regarded by regents, as more clearly associated with the board than with internal university interests.[10]

It is generally reported that the system executive should be the only employee to attend all board meetings and that members of his front line staff and campus executives should attend only upon the invitation of the system executive. It is assumed that he should and would invite them, and the board would agree, if they had special expertise to contribute toward a particular agenda item. Also board committees should be arranged so that the system executive can attend most of them.

It is widely reported that board members, individually and collectively, should visit each campus and its officers for ceremonial, inspection and social functions, but these visits should be separated from the formal business meetings of the board. The formal business meeting is the system executive's "show" and "accountability" and not that of his staff or the campus executives.

In both private and public institutions in the United States the governing boards have traditionally been the highest official authority of the institutions. Boards delegate to administrators responsibilities for implementing policies and reaching goals established; faculties are charged with the responsibilities of academic watch dogs. The quality of the board's decisions are affected by the kinds of recommendations made by administrators, or by faculty through administrative channels. Boards are sensitive to the needs of the public they serve and meeting these needs is an appropriate duty of the board in establishing goals for the institution. Boards are confronted by proposals from special interest groups and possibly pressures from political leaders at both the State and national level.

These may be counter to the legitimate goals of the institution the board serves and detrimental to academic freedom and quality. Here the board has to differentiate between responding to the needs of the public and resisting improper outside pressures that can adversely affect the institution.

Role of the System Executive: Lee and Bowen set the tone for the system executive:

> We hold little brief for the notion that the system executive should be basically a manager, smoothing the way for the campuses to pursue discrete academic paths. The needs of the multicampus university require something more—educational statesmanship of the highest order that can only be provided by the university's chief executive.[11]

Henderson in the chapter "The Role of the Governing Board" in Academic Governance by Baldridge emphasizes that the president should be the only official to relate directly to the board and this is of special importance for resource allocations.[12]

In early practice many boards required that the chief financial officer report to them.

> This proved to be unrealistic in that the president has never been able to divert himself of the principal financial responsibility. The plan is also inconvenient with the concept, now universally approved by authorities that the board should relate to the administration through a single officer, the president.[13] [system executive]

The effectiveness of the system executive and his staff is the foundation of the system, yet they can be the kinds of people found on a single campus although functioning in a different structure. System executives and their central staffs often feel isolated from students, faculty and alumni. Determining the division of labor between the central staff and each of the campuses requires decisions for which no good model has yet been proven, but the load must be shared in multicampus systems.

The central staff, even in small systems, feels strongly that a most important duty of the chief executive is to chair their staff meetings. Staff loyalty among the central staff is highly dependent on personal ties to the system executive. At the system level common campus loyalties are lost and the chief executive has to unite the efforts of his staff. Also he has to establish effective relationships with his campus executives and the proper liaison role of each central officer to the campus officers. If time does not permit the system executive to manage personally both groups, it is better that he personally relate to the campus executives and direct an executive vice-chancellor (or president) to relate to the central staff.

The board, faculty and campus administrative officers often expect the system executive to be familiar with minute details of the campuses. He does not have the time to accomplish this directly, but if briefed frequently by a competent front line staff member in each operational area, he is conversant on campus issues and this is an important morale builder. No one can speak for the system executive on crucial matters, but he must depend on the help of his staff to have up-to-date facts and recommendations. Accordingly the system executive's responsibilities go far beyond a paper relationship with the campuses. He must make planning, policy and resource allocation recommendations to the board, and depends on staff in each basic area to give him the best possible recommendations, based on an in-depth knowledge of each campus. Although the system executive is not expected to document the facts for each decision or recommendation to the board, he must be assured that basic information has been confirmed personally by an executive staff member.

Many multicampus systems have not clearly assigned functional duties to specific staff members. Such assignments are beneficial to the system executive, yet he may need one additional person without assigned duties to perform the unexpected for him. An officer may perform his specific duties plus auxiliary ones but in all except the smallest systems, spreading the efforts of each front line staff member too thinly can be detrimental to both the system executive and the board.

Lee and Bowen offer an explanation to the uncertainties of the system executive:

> The strategic plans of an army group or theater commander consist of his broad and relatively long-range plans, which his subordinates implement. In contrast, the strategy of a system executive often entails enticing his "subordinates into letting him know what their long-range plans are.[14]

The chief executive has many different accomplishments which he is expected to achieve; Frank Hull states:

> Confusion has always existed as to his (the college president) role. From one perspective, the president is "not a leader, but university boss", from another he is a "leader among scholars"—but recently he has come to be foremost a fund raiser.[15]

Algo D. Henderson speaks to the president's needs:

> In one sense the executive officer is president of the educational corporation, just as he would be in any other corporation. In another sense, he is the educational leader of the institution...He is responsible for carrying into operation the policies and decisions of the board. By virtue of the board's authority, it is his duty to inform that body about the operations, the achievements and the problems of the institution. Ordinarily he makes recommendations to the board for actions to be taken by it. It is equally the responsibility of individual board members to avoid meddling in the internal [administrative] affairs of the institution.[16]

The Carnegie Commission describes another burden on academic leaders, "Higher education in the United States has just completed its decade of greatest academic success, in the 1960s. Yet higher education in the early 1970s is experiencing its greatest financial crisis."[17] It is clear that the system executive must embody diverse attributes ranging from political finesse to scholarly respectibility.

The central executive is directly responsible for certain public and ceremonial functions and relationships with the governing board, the governor, state agencies and the legislature. Alsc he must guide and direct his front line staff and campus executives. These activities require more than full-time and he must depend on solid help from front line staff in at least these basic functions: (a) everyday administration, (b) academic relations, (c) program planning, (d) business and finance (e) university counsel and (f) university relations. The chief executive makes decisions in all of these areas, but responsible staff members doing necessary research in each administrative area are especially valuable to the executive for decisions and recommendations to the board.

The system executive will have to make the final decision on how available resources are to be divided between academic and support services, but it is important that recommendations of academic officers be considered on an equal rank to those of the business-finance officer. The chief business-finance officer must also study carefully the budget recommendation prepared by the campus executives in order to give the system executive the best possible analysis. There may not be an agreement among the business-finance officer, the academic affairs officer and the program planning officer. If not, then the system executive has to resort to his own resourcefulness to arrive at the best possible decision, but he should know why his staff had different opinions on budgetary matters.

Two final aspects concerning the chief executive remaining to be considered are selection and review. Academic tradition suggests that administrators be drawn from academic ranks. Although Terry Sanford's presidency at Duke has been highly acclaimed, some faculty members were initially concerned that ultimate decisions in academic matters were vested in one selected from outside academia. Despite the success in academic administration that outsiders like Mr. Sanford may enjoy, internal academic sources of administrators are still preferred by most academicians. The Carnegie Commission comments on this:

> In the first place, there is a strong tradition to higher education that presidents, chancellors, deans, and other top administrative officials should be drawn from the ranks of the faculty. We believe that this tradition is sound. College and university faculties tend to have confidence that an individual who has experienced the intellectual discipline of study for an advanced degree and who has engaged in scholarly teaching and research will be a more effective defender of academic standards and academic freedom than someone who is chosen because he has been a successful leader in business, government, or military service.[18]

The multicampus executive is constantly under conflicting pressures inherent in the complexities of the institution he heads. For this reason, many faculty members feel that a regularly scheduled review of his performance, along with campus executives, would be beneficial to the executives as well as the institution. The State University of New York has a review plan. The Carnegie Commission supports a formal term review:

> The president has usually been appointed on a no-term basis—with the major exception of many community colleges where term appointments are made. He has served at the will of the board. The actual tenure of presidents is now about 6 years—half of what it once was. We believe that some presidents would be aided if a review period were agreed upon in advance so that a more normal opportunity than now exists would be created for mutual reassessment of the situation and of the president's performance. Many deans and department chairmen now serve on just this basis. This should in no way, however, interfere with necessary emergency actions by the board or by the president.[19]

The Commission charges the board with the kind of president it needs and the support he should have:

> We believe consequently, that boards should seek to appoint active rather than passive presidents, presidents who will lead rather than just survive. They should also give presidents adequate authority and staff, and their own support in the difficult task of encouraging constructive change—realizing that periods of change are also periods of unusual tension—and of effectively resolving conflict.[20]

The successful system executive must make visionary recommendations to the board; also he strives to establish the best possible relationships with the governor, legislature and other state agencies. He must implement the policies and achieve goals of the board and identify clearly understood areas of shared administration between the central office and the campuses. He must select a highly qualified staff and give directions to the campuses; the staff advises on recommendations to the board. The system head must recognize the academic responsibility of the campuses and be sensitive to faculty views in their role as academic overseers.

Responsibility of the System's Central Staff: Many experts who have written on multicampus systems feel that the system executive must have enough personal staff and cabinet level administrators to give him sound and well researched recommendations in the various functions for which he is responsible. Lee and Bowen state this:

> Trustees and state governments alike must recognize that universitywide staff are essential—in numbers and experience—if the individual campuses are collectively to become a system. So must the universities themselves. Only rarely have they taken advantage of the unusual structure of the multicampus system, with its opportunities for executive interchange, for use of faculty as staff and consultants, and for a systemwide executive career program.[21]

From their interviews at nine systems, Lee and Bowen found that front line administrative officers, cabinet officers, may not be sufficiently sure of their duties and at the lower level of the central staff, considerable confusion may prevail about the description of duties. If the front line administrative officer is clearly assigned his primary duty, then he is able to let those working for him know their specific duties.

Clark Kerr states:

> Provide adequate administrative assistance of high quality so that delays will be minimized and the civil service of the system can be fully effective. There will be more formal documents to handle and they will be more important in the life of the institution; they should be carefully prepared and thoughtfully reviewed.[22]

Howard H. Litchfield recognizes the need for an adequate staff and structure:

> In concrete terms, the lack of proper organization is that the president and provost become essential mechanical officers rather than academic leaders . . .[this problem can be alleviated by] providing the president with the types of staff assistance in the field of budgeting, personnel organization and methods, academic research and total institutional planning which would normally be available to the heads of other organizations in our society that are of comparable size.[23]

Many front line central system staff positions and personnel have evolved upward through the flagship campus and this practice is often compared to the faults of the inbreeding of too many faculty from the same institution. People with a cross section of backgrounds are needed to give the system executive the most objective recommendations. A movement of officers from universitywide to campus and from campus to universitywide, after a reasonable term of office, is encouraged by many systems to enhance a better mutual understanding and improved cooperation.

The system executive and his cabinet level officers all should be working to serve the needs of the campuses and achieving the real strengths of the multicampus system, coordination, diversity and cooperation. Not to achieve this invites external criticism that the system is no better than the sum of the independent campuses. Decisions on policies and procedures to achieve these three major goals have to be centralized. The campuses will accept this restraint if they are delegated decision making authority in less crucial areas such as lower rank nonacademic personnel classifications and appointments, contract and grant administration and promotions.

As observed frequently, the system executive should have a large enough staff at the cabinet level to cover each important function, except for those that only he can do as a matter of policy. Criticisms would be leveled at the universitywide administration, much as an over administered campus would be criticized, if each cabinet level officer had too many assistants, and assistants to assistants. Another argument for a minimum number of assistants to cabinet level officers is to require the executive staff to research firsthand their recommendations to the system executive. Each cabinet level officer should be fully informed in his assigned function and he should not depend extensively on secondary advice when he makes evaluations and recommendations to the executive. However, the central academic affairs, business-finance and program planning officers must have a good source of cost data and institutional research information. This is increasingly important when a system consists of many institutions with different objectives such as North Carolina and Wisconsin, where grouping institutions into academic clusters has become necessary.

Since the central administration is to share duties with the campuses, fewer people will be needed at the second and third levels, otherwise they will attempt to perform duties which should be delegated to the campuses. It is logical to assume that a campus of a system would spend less for administration than an independent campus because of the shared responsibility between the central staff and the campus staff. The total administrative cost of a multicampus system should be less than the sum of an equal number of independent campuses, and the service to the public should be more than the total from an equal number of independent campuses with comparable resources.

The campus executive has problems of a general nature to solve and may not feel that members of the system executive's staff give high priority to his needs. This can be a source of friction and must be resolved by the system executive by persuasion and meetings which he will chair and involve central officers and campus executives; faculty representative may also be included depending on the issues. In many systems the central officers reporting to the executive and the campus executives constitute the central cabinet.

Except for those systems with a very large number of campuses a deputy to the system executive or an executive vice-president or vice-chancellor is unusual. Officers at this rank are discouraged for all but the largest systems because they can insulate the system executive from his campus executives and front line central staff. It is especially important for the system executive to have direct formal and informal relationships with his campus executives. This becomes more difficult as the number of campuses in the system increases and is an argument for limiting the types of campuses in a system to those that have similar objectives and academic levels, although they are diversified in scope and mission. The system executive gains much by presiding over meetings of his vice-presidents, or vice-chancellors, and if managable should not delegate this to an executive vice-president, or vice-chancellor.

Cost analysis and institutional research data are very important to many of the system executive's front line staff members for budgeting, resource allocation and accountability. The business and finance officer may not always make the best use of data available to him, and he may fail to discuss the mechanics of the budget formulation with a cross section of interested parties including faculty representatives.

Accordingly, the academic affairs and the program planning officers should participate with him in the formulation of the budget after submissions have been received from the campuses. Millett points out that important data are often widely hoarded in different campus offices and do not have maximum value for budgeting.

The front line members of the central staff must contribute significantly to the process of resource allocation. The program officer considers the value of programs to those being served externally and internally evaluates productivity of graduates. The academic affairs officer is responsible for improving quality of programs and balancing departmental efforts. Accordingly, he may judiciously recommend cancellation of weaker programs in order to obtain financial resources to strengthen the better ones. The business and finance officer must promote support funds in order to undergird adequately the predetermined academic programs. The system executive should not always expect consensus from the cooperative efforts of these officers on resource allocations, but if the recommendation of each is sound and he evaluates their judgements correctly, his decision should be the correct one.

The System Staff Executive Officers:

A. The Administrative Officer: The work of the administrative officer can help the system executive administer the daily activities of his office by assuring that actions are in accordance with established policy. The chief executive should feel comfortable that in his absence these decisions and actions will be correctly and promptly executed. Some system executives use the chief administrative officer to assist with the unexpected, not obviously related to one of the functional areas, but others use an officer without an assigned function for this purpose. The chief administrative officer is the system executive's delegated officer for executing the civil service functions of operation, and may be called upon as the executive desires for recommendations for procedural change or policy consideration.

B. The Academic Affairs Officer: This central staff officer prepares guidelines for decisions on faculty tenure, appointments and promotions; he also evaluates the decisions which are delegated to the campuses. Few multicampus systems have done this; it is this officer's responsibility to provide guidance and make evaluations but not personnel decisions. Although the role is advisory relative to promotions and appointments, his judgment is often so well respected that he is consulted voluntarily before decisions are made at the campus.

On a more abstract level, this officer is also responsible for assessing the quality of academic programs.

> Quality is of the essence in academic life and it is hard to measure; but among carefully selected institutions and within the same institution it may be assumed to be sufficiently equal so that comparisons can be made—it is easier to compare quality than it is to measure it. But even within these restricted limits great care must be taken in making comparisons; they are a starting point but not the end point.[24]

Quality offers a special challenge to this officer in making recommendations to the system executive for resource allocation and preparing criteria for the campuses. The front line academic officer must establish effective relationships with the campus deans, department chairmen and faculty, acceptable to the campus executives. Additionally, he may encourage formal and informal faculty participation in governance at the system level. He is the interface between the student-faculty family and the central administration, and must present legitimate concerns to the system executive.

He assesses budgetary needs by academic category, level and other related requirements and then recommends to the system executive the allocation of available resources to best meet academic needs. With faculty consultation, he passes judgment on the quality of proposed programs as well as existing ones. He must have the best data that can be derived from every perspective.

The Carnegie Commission describes some new areas of the seventies that will be most challenging to the principal academic officer in recommendations for resource allocations. In order to strengthen some programs, he will find that resources will have to be gained by cancelling unproductive and weak programs.

> Comparative costs studies for groups of institutions can also be of great value in identifying cost differences that may not be entirely explained by differences in quality. One of the most illuminating of such recent studies was "The Twelve College Cost-Quality Study", conducted by McKinsey and Company for 12 relatively prestigious colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. The study revealed wide differences in costs per student, particularly in sciences, as well as quite substantial differences in course enrollments per FTE faculty member. There were also wide variations in such items as administrative costs per student. The individual colleges are now studying these results, with a view, among other things, to identifying programs that have unusually high costs that may not be wholly explained by high quality.[25]
>
> The Commission recommends that all institutions of higher education place emphasis on policies that will ensure budgetary flexibility. Combinations of policies that will achieve this goal will vary from institution to institution but may well include elements of (1) selective cutbacks, (2) across-the-board budgetary cuts, (3) consolidation of existing programs, (4) readaptation of existing programs, (5) "every tub on its own bottom", and (6) central reassignment of positions vacated due to resignation, retirement, or death.[26]

C. The Program Planning Officer: The principal program planning officer of the central staff is primarily concerned internally with high cost/low productivity academic programs, inadequately populated courses, replication of programs and externally assessing how well the university is serving the state within the responsibilities of its mission. His assessment of external services and internal productivity may prompt him to recommend to the system executive a reallocation of resources among programs in order to serve the state in an optimum manner. He may propose that high cost/low benefit programs be dropped in order to start new ones of a greater value to the state. The academic affairs officer may differ on the basis of educational quality. In making his decision, the system executive will have to weigh the possible opposing views. He must have the best possible advice from every perspective.

The officers for academic affairs, program planning and business-finance all need the results of cost analyses and institutional research studies. There may be competition for the time of these technical experts and except for budget preparation, it seems that in most cases the program planning officer should have priority. He is concerned with short-range, immediate-range, and long-range plans, and reliable cost data and institutional information are prerequisites for his recommendations to the system executive.

Support from foundations, the federal government and gifts all have an important impact on program plans for the university. Accordingly, the program planning officer is the logical central officer to coordinate the activities of the campus development directors and those elements of the work of the graduate and extension deans relating to federal relations and national associations. By staying abreast of national policy changes their possible future impact on the university can be predicted.

Few multicampus systems have staff members assigned full-time to federal government relations. This study confirms the general opinion that the campuses can improve federal agency contacts concerning projects, but a central officer should be responsible for forecasting the impact on the university of anticipated federal programs and policy.

The program planning officer must, therefore, function at several levels. He must analyze costs and benefits over the long-term and apply this knowledge to current operations as well as plans for the future. He must carefully integrate his work with that of the academic affairs and business-finance officers and determine the importance of funding from outside sources in advancing the missions of the campuses. To the planner falls the task of differentiating between replication and duplication. He must have had previous academic experience to make this evaluation and expertise to evaluate external needs.

D. The Business-Finance Officer: The business-finance officer would logically make his recommendation to the system executive on support services and nonacademic staff needed after academic plans and programs and their quality levels are established. He should continuously reevaluate these needs as academic program emphasis, capital improvements and other priorities change. There are many national reports where campus programs have been adjusted to prior business and finance decisions rather than the reverse order required to place values in proper perspective. Lee and Bowen note that the chief business-finance officer holds an important key to public trust in the university:

> The challenge to the multicampus university, is to demonstrate its willingness and capacity to develop new concepts of financial measurement, to take the lead in sophisticated and sensitive evaluation of its major cost factors, and to develop a basis for budgeting which will command the confidence of both professionals and politicians.[27]

This officer has many duties that are uniform among multicampus systems and these are generally understood to be his responsibility. Questions arise to the appropriate rank of his recommendation relative to those of the front line academic affairs officer or the program planning officer. Obviously, no academic officer should challenge his recommendation on the cost of insurance or the amount of fuel needed.

Reports are not infrequent about the academic plan and other programs being shaped by prior recommendations of the business-finance officer, and often too little involvement of faculty and campus officers in budget building is invited.

The business-finance officer is the key person to the mechanics of budget preparation. Inputs are needed from the broadest possible range of sources before this officer presents the first budget draft to the system executive. Extreme caution must be exercised not to favor supporting functions at the expense of academic programs. The psychological reactions of those who will evaluate the budget externally must be contemplated. Responsibility falls on this officer to request and justify adjustments in formula that may be proposed by coordination agencies or legislatures.

The system executive's relationships with the campus executives are greatly affected by the mutual understanding of the budget process. Formulas can be an effective way to approach budgetary equity among the campuses, but an additional discretionary component is also needed.

The multicampus system should take a strong initiative in developing strength in its budget format as this can restrain state agencies from developing their own budgetary rationale which may not adequately meet the university's needs. In most state governments it is agreed that the system executive has the responsibility for setting priorities for new programs, subject to board approval.

To improve the budget format and documentation, the central business-finance officer must have good basic data. It is reported that:

> Obtaining better data and making it more widely available within the academic community [is important]. It is particularly important to have (a) global cost and output data among institutions of comparable quality and with comparable endeavors and (b) specific cost and output data among departments within the same institution.[28]

The people designing the budget format must be cognizant that the multicampus system is big business irrespective of how well it executes its educational objectives. This officer is responsible for control of funds, auditing, investments, the physical plant and other non-academic functions, all of which are services to the academic programs of the campuses. A counterpart on each campus is a necessity.

E. The University Counsel: The university counsel is an important member of the system executive's staff and should be available on a full-time basis. The system executive may desire another officer on his staff to serve as secretary of the university and secretary of the board which entails responsibility for board minutes. The trend seems to be that the (legal) counsel and secretary report to the system executive rather than the board, if permitted by law.

F. The University Relations Officer: The university relations officer is concerned with both internal and external communications. The system executive must have these good interactions. This officer will coordinate the work of the campus public relation officers. Although the central academic officer should be charged with the responsibility of keeping the system executive informed about faculty and student interests and problems, often the university relations officer can be of further help in explaining policies to the faculties and students. Coordinating the work of the campus alumni directors should be a responsibility of this office.

Lee and Bowen summarize their observations relating to public relations:

> A university has no tax deductions, and money spent on publicity is real money. A less tangible inhibition related to public status attaches to the publicity function itself. Internally or externally, some tools and methods, stock in trade of Madison Avenue, are out of the question for a public university, and probably for private ones as well.

> Public relations officers are the outpost line when inevitable disputs arise. They are asked to clarify the intangible, and with a straight face.
>
> Public Relations does not generally occupy a particularly lofty position in the hierarchy of the universitywide administration. In only one system does a "cabinet officer" have public relations as an exclusive responsibility.[29]

As described earlier in this report the use of titles such as vice-president, vice-chancellor, or director for front line administrative officers is deliberately avoided. This study suggests that this officer be one of the chief executive's cabinet officers, although his duties may be less demanding than academic affairs or business-finance described above.

Inherent in all systems is a communication gap between the central staff and the faculty and the students. The university relations officer can help narrow the gap, but this study suggests that mutual understandings between the faculty and the central administration is a primary duty of the central academic officer and the campus executives, and a secondary duty of the university relations officer.

Legislatures do not accept a university's promoting the need for its services. This suggests that more emphasis be given to internal communications, and external efforts be pursued in a softer manner and largely through intermediary friends. This officer often manages legislative relations.

Other officers than these basic ones are noted in many systems and a complete list of titles of officers reporting to the system executive at several systems is shown in the appendixes. Titles are often confusing in describing what officers actually do. All officers described in this section should be identified as a part of the "office of the system executive". No reference is made to the need of the system executive for personal staff requirements as these vary widely depending on the style of administration of the executive. The personal staff would not direct others and would not likely alter the basic administrative structure.

Administration of Extension: Probably in no other area do administrative structures vary so widely among systems with similar objectives than they do in extension. Few central staffs have a cabinet level officer for extension, with Missouri and Tennessee being interesting exceptions. Some systems do not have anyone at the central level to coordinate extension work of the various campuses, but where there is an officer, his duties are most often coordination and service and not policy making or operational. Extension is often a component of the duties of a person charged with other activities and reporting to the central academic officer or another member of the system executive's staff. Agricultural extension is usually administered by a campus dean or director. Wisconsin and Maryland are notable exceptions from most with each having a separate unit for extension. In Wisconsin the head of extension reports to an associate vice-president while in Maryland the Chancellor for University College reports to the President.

Lee and Bowen found that extension was often given a low priority and frequently lacking in action. Increasing service to the state through extension has been a concern of many boards and executives. Whether Wisconsin's plan of a separate extension administration and staff or the University of Maryland's University College have merit over charging the campuses with the direct responsibility of supporting and implementing extension programs, as defined by system policy, will undoubtedly continue to be debated. Where separate staff and administration exist for extension, neither the system academic officer nor the campus deans has the input or responsibility they would have in other structures where management of extension is directed through channels from the system executive to the campus executives. If extension is delegated to the campuses, the field staff members are usually responsible to the appropriate dean and universitywide is concerned only with coordination to avoid duplication. The vice-president for extension at the University of Tennessee provides motivation, services and information for the campuses to implement programs in their specialities. His efforts are extensive and appreciated by the campuses. In Missouri the Vice-President for Extension is operationally responsible for the unified extension effort.

Research Administration: Lee and Bowen report that research management is the activity that seems the least touched by the multicampus structure. Only a few systems have a cabinet level officer for research administration and these are usually carry-over positions from the former flagship campus organization. Institutional funds for research most often are appropriated through regular academic channels to departments or mission oriented research units. In contrast to some smaller less prestigious institutions, multicampus systems do not often feel the need for a full-time Washington representative in residence. The University of California is an exception, but this is believed to be continued from historical factors and travel distance. In multicampus systems the campus graduate deans and faculty are the key liaison personnel with Washington project funding agencies and this practice seems to work well.

Most systems review proposals at the central level only if the dollar value is so large that it could result in an institutional commitment greater than the campus alone could accommodate. However, when central staffs have provided the impetus for the pooling of human and physical resources from various campuses the cooperative endeavors have been rewarding from numerous perspectives.

Alternate Administrative Officer Structure: A modified structure to the proposed six basic cabinet level staff officers, plus others of the system executive's choosing, reporting directly to the system executive is that of the University of California. The University of California does not use the title executive vice-president, probably for the reasons given in previous justification for the system executive to be directly related to his campus executives and cabinet level staff. The University of California has a Vice-President of the University who is recognized as the most important vice-president and acts for the President in his absence. The vice-presidents with specific duties report directly to the president and not through the Vice-President of the University. The staff of the Vice-President of the University consists of well qualified people and this office performs duties for the president that might otherwise require more vice-presidents reporting directly to the president.

If this modified structure were adopted for a system of fewer campuses than California, this study suggests that the vice-president for the university be qualified to meet one of the basic functional needs in addition to being capable of performing the more general duties required. At the University of California the Vice-President of the University is in much the same position as a senior vice-president in industry. He is on the same structural level as the basic vice-presidents, but he has broader duties to perform for the president. This structure seems unnecessary for a system with only a few campuses, but if the system executive desires to reduce the number of people reporting to him, it can be accomplished this way. This does not alter direct reporting of other cabinet officers and campus executives to the system executive. There is a danger, however, that this vice-president, or vice-chancellor, can be more powerful than desired by the campus executives.

The number and duties of the system executive's personal staff cannot be delineated because these depend on his style of operation. For example, some system heads may prefer an executive assistant to perform the duties described under the principal administrative officer's position, therefore, his structural relationship to other central officers and campus executives would be drastically changed.

Chapter 7

CAMPUS ELEMENTS IN THE GOVERNANCE OF MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS

The Campus Chief Executive: The work of the chief campus administrative officer is reasonably uniform among different systems. He has the responsibility for implementing policy on behalf of the system executive, directing the work of his staff and motivating faculty leaders. He would ask the system executive for a decision only on controversial matters or when no clear policy has been established.

> On the whole, campus executives in all systems consult with appropriate central administrative officers before making major administrative appointments, whether such consultation is required or not. Some complaints were heard if a requirement existed. "I hate to go up there, hat in hand, to get permission to hire my own assistant." More often, however, formal limits on appointing authority simply recognize that campus executives usually seek, obtain, and follow advice from the system executive or the members of his staff in whom they have confidence.[30]

The same logic that suggests the need for consultation between the campus executive and the central staff before a commitment is made for a major campus appointment proposes that the system executive seek the evaluation of "academic interest" on the board, plus opinions of existing campus leaders before appointing a campus executive on one of the campuses. Mutual trusts and cooperation accompany decisions based on these principles.

A division of labor between the central staff and the campuses is a necessity; most campus executives are pleased not to lobby with the legislature for funds. Students and alumni associate with a particular campus, which logically makes fund raising and alumni development almost totally campus functions.

The Carnegie Commission points out the campus administration has a stronger interface with the faculty than the central administration:

> The American system, however, has had, and continues to have, more authority vested in instrumentalities intermediate between the central government and the senior faculty members--the board of trustees and the presidency--than has been the case in most or even all other nations; and it also has allowed more participation by junior faculty members than in many other nations. The campus-wide administration has been a comparatively strong point of power.[31]

> Campuses have become larger and more complex; there are more levels of decision making within the campus and above the campus. Decisions often take more time and are farther removed from the operating level. Loyalty to the institution is less likely to develop as size increases and complexity multiplies. Also, the strengthening of professional relationships has been drawing attachments away from the campus.[32]

Most writers have reported that strong centralization of authority, rather than a more generous delegation to the campuses, can delay decisions and make their validity less significant. Most central systems desire to delegate operating authority to the campus, and some allow flexibility in application of central and board policy to meet special needs of a particular campus. The system executive delegates to the campus executive and he in turn delegates to his deans, other administrators, and faculty. To avoid external criticisms and faculty questions of priorities, the system executive must be sure that the campus executive does not overexpand his administrative staff. Because of shared labor, total administrative cost for a multicampus system will be less than if each campus operated independently.

Campus leadership in resource utilization is vitally important; the Carnegie Commission describes an important area of conservation:

> Achieving effective use of faculty time is central to a program aimed at effective use of resources in higher education. Clearly, colleges and universities with low student-faculty ratios need to give more attention to measures aimed at increasing these ratios and thus achieving more effective use of their faculties than do institutions with average or relatively high student-faculty ratios. In fact, we would suggest that institutions with unusually high student-faculty ratios may need to take steps designed to reduce them, difficult as this may be in underfinanced institutions.
>
> Student-faculty ratios vary widely among groups of similar institutions.[33]
>
> The goals of effective use of faculty time is more likely to be accomplished through sustained attention to the many facets of the problem than through any single, sweeping change. We recommend consideration of the following: carefully studying and adopting a varied mixture of class sizes at the different levels of instruction and establishing appropriate average class sizes that different departments may be expected to meet.[34]

Epstein states the faculty view toward the campus administrators:

> To the extent that campus administrators become primarily faculty representatives or virtually faculty delegates, they do not serve as agents of regent or of state authority. In practice, of course, they try to mediate between public authority and the academic community. It is as

> mediators that university presidents, [campus executives] in particular, now frequently perceive themselves. I believe that the term is well applied to the nature of the work of university administrators, as it is to administrators in many other organizations. I do not regard mediation and compromise as poor or powerless substitutes for hierarchical command.[35]

> Much more clearly than at any higher level in a university, the professor's judgments in departmental decision making are specialized ones derived from his scholarly work. They cannot be challenged on academic grounds by administrators or by any other officials outside the specialized areas.[36]

Central officers must be catalysts, and the campus executive must support the following recommendations of the Carnegie Commission if institutions are able to make financial ends meet with optimum quality within resources available:

- Seeking to prevent undue proliferation of courses by periodic review of the totality of course offerings in a department
- Involving the faculty in developing policies directed toward achieving appropriate and equitable teaching loads
- Establishing standards relating to a reasonable maximum amount of time to be spent in consulting activities
- Maintaining reasonable and equitable policies relating to sabbatical leaves for all career members of the faculty, including assistant professors
- Analyzing costs of support personnel, in comparison with those of other similar institutions, with a view to identifying possible excessive costs in some aspects of support functions, but also of making certain that these functions are being conducted efficiently and that highly paid faculty members are not performing functions that could be delegated to lower-paid support personnel.[37]

Effective use of faculty and staff is a most important objective of each campus executive because about eighty percent of the budget for most campuses goes to salaries; other expenses are relatively low. It has been said previously that system executives should be nationally prominent educational leaders, and in delegating shared responsibility to the campus, they must not forget that the campus executive is often an educational leader also of national stature. Each campus executive needs a well qualified officer in at least these areas: business and finance, student personnel, university relations, admissions, alumni affairs, development and most of all academic affairs. The campus structure can be flexible to satisfy both the system executive and campus executive, but each basic central officer must have a designated contact officer, or officers, on each campus to provide for an exchange of information. The central academic officer also needs to communicate with faculty and student leaders; some other central officers also should have more than one campus contact point. The system executive and campus executive must make clear to their respective staffs that decisions are made through established line authority, but to make the system function as a unit, communications must occur at several lateral planes. When a central officer is planning a trip to the campus to visit with his designated contact, or contacts, he should, as a matter of courtesy, let the campus executive know of his plans and the objectives of his visit.

In conclusion, the viewpoint of a faculty member on the relations between campus and central staff is beneficial as the faculty must recognize this pluralism of duties.

> Pluralism implies no such clear-cut solutions. Certainly, from my viewpoint, it recognizes in so substantial a degree the legitimacy of the several diverse interests within a large university that it limits the powers of

> all external and internal majorities. And, while attempting to draw new and sharper lines between authorities than are now apparent, I acknowledge that boundaries are not definitively established. By its nature, pluralism leaves room for continuous adjustment of power relationships as interests develop and as functions change.[38]

The Faculty: A prevalent view among the faculty is that they not only are further away from the decision making center as members of a multicampus or a statewide consolidated system, but also that many campuses of a system have a greater number of administrative personnel than an independent campus. The system executive's chief academic affairs officer and campus executive should be able to work with the faculty to alleviate this concern. If an over administration of the campus above the deans' level exists, it can cause a serious backlash with coordinating agencies or legislatures, as well as with faculties. The same problems would occur if the central office were over staffed relative to the campuses at ranks below the cabinet level.

The Carnegie Commission points out that the faculty often have strong influences or control over teaching loads, courses, research projects, class sizes, admissions, grades, degrees and other elements of its work load. The problem cited is that the faculty have neither the responsibility of raising money to support their efforts nor the inclination to respond to critics on how they use their time. They are further separated from the system executive than the campus executive and have not always appreciated that in the real world the resources are limited and failure to raise funds should not constitute indictment of their administrative leaders.[39]

This suggests that an appropriate university faculty group is a necessary adjunct to the administrative structure of the system, although this may include only a few persons as is now the case in Illinois and Missouri. In 1969 Lee and Bowen reported only a few examples of integrated system faculty groups with delegated authority. The faculty need to understand both the advantages and disadvantages of multicampus systems over single campuses and to know where decisions are made. When this is accomplished, they should have a much better appreciation for the system and irritations about small matters will be alleviated.

A close alliance between the system's academic officer and all faculties is a primary duty of this office which must integrate their views into constructive information for the system executive. If there exists an organized system level faculty group, the central staff academic officer would meet with the group to help maintain a good mutual understanding with the central administration. The fear of loss of campus power is perhaps the predominant reason that faculties have not sought a greater formal universitywide role. Delegates to a formally structured faculty group must have effective channels of communications on their respective campuses. Not only must they keep their peers informed and seek their counsel, but all academic officers, including the campus executive, should be apprised of developments. Faculty views are needed by central administrative officers as well as by campus managers.

At the system and campus levels, faculty groups are vital to assure communications in both directions. Rapport will be increased by a broader mutual understanding and knowledge of the problems of the faculty and administration; the external restraints on the campus and system executives as well as the board is an example in point. At the system level this requires the cooperative efforts of the academic officer and the university relations officer, while at the campus level it involves faculty leaders, the chief administrator and academic officers.

Faculty participation in universitywide activities is not without its problems, however. Lee and Bowen describe a problem resulting from faculty serving on universitywide commissions:

> The generally negative attitude of campus executives to having "their faculty" act as part of an all-university governing structure is paralleled here in the attitudes of system executives...Within the multicampus university, some form of faculty participation in universitywide academic governance is almost universally recognized as legitimate, however irritating the particular form or extent might be to the campus executives. Similar legitimacy does not attach to faculty participation in the activities of the [state] coordinating agency, at least in the minds of the system executives.[40]

Just as the governing board may not be exactly sure of the authority it has from the state, it should not bother faculty if details of their authority are not spelled out; faculty authority will be sharply defined as the system matures. Campus faculty bodies fear inflexible policies for all campuses and loss of authority if an all system representative assembly had power. Faculty resolutions can be helpful to campus and system executives in their external relationship if they are based on facts and written after full consideration of all relevant material.

Lee and Bowen report:

> It is difficult to develop a systemwide faculty organization in a university composed of several campuses, even when they are basically alike in mission, faculty qualifications, and enrollment patterns. It is much more complicated when campuses, by design, differ on all of these counts.

Because of the administrative complexities of the multicampus system, faculty involvement and faculty power complicate administrative lines. This may delay decisions, but it should also enhance their quality. Few disagree that the faculty voice should be heard at the system level, but issues of appropriate concern and procedures for expressing them have not yet been clearly identified by either faculty or administration. The authority, if any, which should be delegated to university faculty groups is yet to be determined.

The all university faculty representatives are often criticized by faculty members who disagree with their recommendation, but this seems to be an element of the democratic system. Many of us often disagree with actions of elected officials for whom we had voted. Some campus executives feel that any type of universitywide faculty group invites bypasses around them. This study suggests that a problem exists only if the campus excutive has failed to develop good relationships with his faculty.

The authority which should be delegated to a policy making universitywide faculty body continues in doubt because this authority would be at the expense of the campus faculty, central administrative staff and campus administrative staff. For this reason, advisory groups seem adequate for many systems to inform central officers and avoid weakening of campus faculty bodies.

In the University of Illinois system a coordinating faculty committee of eighteen representatives of the three campuses decides if the action of any one of the three campus senates concerns the other two. The other two senates consider the issues separately and if one disagrees, makes its reports through the eighteen member senates' conference to the system executive and governing board. The conference may offer separate or confirming recommendations.

Lee and Bowen address faculty organizations and collective bargaining:

> On their face, collective bargaining practices and principles do not appear to be consistent with present models of faculty governance, whether legislative or advisory. Can a senate be both an effective advisor and an effective pressure group for faculty working conditions? Can the system executive be the leader of the faculty and the spokesman for their employer? We have our doubts but are equally doubtful if the alternatives are necessarily more desirable or less complex.[42]

The Carnegie Commission speaks to collective bargaining as a policy matter:

> Our general view is that collective bargaining, to the extent that it enters higher education, should not now become the new system of governance. Rather, it should be an amendment, in certain areas, to the existing forms of governance, as it has been, at least until now, in Great Britain. We believe this is the best current approach in the interests of preserving strong faculty influence over academic affairs, of assuring a heavy emphasis on quality and merit in making academic decisions, and of retaining a reasonable degree of independence from external control for institutions of higher education.[43]

Whatever the role of the faculty in multicampus governance and regardless of the faculty decision on collective bargaining, the faculty should retain the traditional role as the academic watchdog. As the Commission observes:

> ...greater self-discipline within the academic enterprise, a greater sense of responsibility for effective use of resources-much has been left to the conscience of the academic community but this conscience now needs better ways to inform itself and to assert itself. We believe it is important to preserve the essential quality of and thus the essential faculty responsibility for academic life. It is also important to realize what dif-

> ferent kinds of external pressures both can and cannot do—they can guide but, they cannot coerce effort.[44]

The Student Body: As students participate for short periods in campus activities, an organized structure at the multicampus level does not seem possible. Student advice should be sought on an ad hoc basis or through rap sessions. Most student interests are local campus in nature, and any formal organization should be left to the campus. However, occasional meetings of the system executive and his chief academic officer with student leaders are important to the communications process.

The Carnegie Commission has this significant reference to student involvement:

> Students evaluate the teaching performance of faculty members and this evaluation is made a part of the record when promotions are considered. We do not favor students serving on appointment and promotion committees.[45]
>
> Some of the most valuable contributions of student participation can be at the departmental level, which is the most active working level of the campus. Students are often a large and heterogeneous group, but within their major fields they are less numerous and more homogeneous.[46]

The multicampus universities serve very large numbers of students, but the interface between the student and the administration is predominently at the local campus level and especially at the departmental level. Hence, student participation in academic governance is best conducted on the local campus or departmental basis.

Alumni: Alumni loyalty is to the campus and this should not be discouraged. Representative alumni from all of the campuses can be brought together for a common cause and this is one of the strengths of the multicampus system. The central university relations officer seems to be the logical coordinator of the alumni directors. One common cause which will often rally the alumni collectively from the various campuses is legislative support for the university budget.

Combined alumni meetings may be successful in distant cities, but are considered to be of dubious value near the home campuses. Although alumni must be developed through campus efforts, universitywide organizations constituted of representatives from each group are urged. Organized alumni from all campuses in the system may be of invaluable assistance to the university relations officer of the central staff in many important endeavors.

Most systems approach legislative relationships in an inconspicious manner. The system executive is the key person in this relationship, but the central university relations officer should be able to represent him in briefing alumni and other university friends. Alumni groups can be very helpful but are not to be looked upon as lobbyists.

Chapter 8

FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

What Decisions Are Made Where: Having explored the components of a university from the governing board to the student body and alumni, it is now necessary to discuss how these elements interact in order to successfully administer a multicampus university. Terry Clark in his chapter on "Institutions of Innovation" discusses decentralizations as improving decision making:

> Where decisions are made by individuals, generally the more decentralized the decisions making structure, the more innovative the organization. For example, leaders in highly centralized university systems, except in revolutionary situations, tend to be more experienced and mature and also more conservative, than other system members. Furthermore, their decisions are based on their particular values. Would-be innovators must consequently phrase their claims in terms of the values of these leaders. But not every innovation can be justified. More decentralized systems, where only the consent of a few persons is needed, makes more coalitions possible and innovation more apt to be institutionalized.[47]

Lee and Bowen agree,

> Decentralize to the maximum extent possible. The burden of proof should be on the centralizers. In particular, it is important to decentralize personal relations among people, while it is easier to centralize the handling of things—like purchasing, accounting, etc. Rely more on postaudit than preaudit. Work with broad formulas for financing and broad policies to guide actions, rather than with the line item control and specific rules.[48]

Some arguments for centralization are:

> The vastly improved techniques of centralized direction in industry and government are also applicable to higher education, and the new technology aids and abets these techniques.[49]

If the important issues often repeated by Lee and Bowen of cooperation, specialization and diversity are to be achieved, initial efforts, guidance and surveillance from the central staff appear absolutely necessary. Surveillance should be based on ex post evaluations rather than on frequent advance directives.

Policy, resource allocation, planning and auditing are predominently central functions while contract and grant solicitation and administration are examples of predominently campus functions. Where programmatic cutbacks must be made the decision making process should involve campus administrators, faculty and students to help the central administration and board to explore alternates and evaluate impact before making the final decision.

Either the system executive or his front line program planning officer, and possibly other central officers, need to keep in touch with changing federal government trends to assess their impact on the multicampus system, but contacts with specific funding agency in the interest of projects are best made by the campus through the graduate dean, the dean or director of extension, and individual faculty members. This approach is preferred by the agencies. However, changing trends can have serious overall impacts; knowledge of these, and monitoring their effect on the university is a central function.

Walter R. Boland reports that, "The faculty in larger institutions are much more likely to develop a strong faculty government...the results indicate quite clearly that the larger institutions are much more likely to have decisions made within the department."[50] Departmental recommendations reviewed upward through channels can achieve better mutual understandings than directives from the top downward.

Many feel that continuing education is a function of the campus and that the campus executive, the college deans and department chairmen should manage this with the same enthusiasm as their resident teaching and research programs. If field staff are assigned to the campuses, there is need for central coordination, but not direction. Extension and continuing education are highly centralized in a few systems, but in most others, they are almost totally a campus responsibility.

Section IV describes twenty-four administrative areas and the varying degrees of system and campus responsibility in decision making. Opinions vary greatly, but a rationale can be discerned of opinions and experience on the degree of centralization of these several managerial components.

Medical education is very expensive and often an executive responsible for health affairs on one or more campuses reports directly to the system executive. The fiscal management of teaching hospitals, to avoid subsidy from instructional funds, is difficult and is one justification for a line officer for health affairs. The reason for avoiding this line function is the fear at the campus level that if one officer on the executive's staff has some line authority, other central officers also may seek to gain direct operating authority.

Both the State University of New York and the City University of New York clearly meet Lee and Bowen's definition of a multicampus university system yet a wide range of objectives and academic levels among component members of each of these systems creates a more complex planning, assessment and decision making process than for systems like the University of Missouri or the University of California. Florida is not described as a multicampus system by Lee and Bowen because one board and one executive control all higher level institutions in the state. Yet in Florida the goals of the institutions and decision making in the state system are more similar to Lee and Bowen's definition of a segmented multicampus system than either the City University of New York or the State University of New York.

Results of this study fail to substantiate a different general administrative structure for decision making for Florida than for the University of California or the University of Missouri. The same basic administrative structure will serve a statewide consolidated system or a multicampus system, but when a system has members at different academic levels, the administration has the obligation to categorize campuses for many reasons and all cannot expect to reach the level of the highest, but neither should the highest be reduced to the average.

A difference does exist in statewide board systems if the campus heads report directly to the statewide board without an intervening executive. Lee and Bowen make a strong case for the value of the system executive but whether a state has one system or more, each with a central executive, does not appear to require a radically different administrative structure for each system. The following from Lee and Bowen seems equally applicable to multicampus or single state board systems:

> In the context of the multicampus universities, the most serious need is for the board to become concerned with systemwide matters—with promoting and evaluating the diversity, specialization, and cooperation in educational programs among campuses for which the multicampus university is uniquely qualified.[51]

> While generally recognized in most of the nine multicampus universities, in an unfortunate few the universitywide table of organization is too thin to aid adequately the chief executive and the board.[52]

An executive vice-president or a deputy to the system executive is discouraged because if this officer exists, the system executive is likely to be more insulated from his campus executives and also from his basic central front line executives in decision making. Many arguments can be given for the campus executive reporting directly to the system executive, but if the system has a very large number of campuses, and especially if these are diverse ones, there is a limit as to how effectively the system executive can communicate with the campuses. The California structure is one answer and a vice-president, or vice-chancellor, for each category of institutions is another option. The latter provides a maximum of only three additional front line officers above the six basic executives described earlier. The State University of New York, however, uses the position of an executive vice-chancellor which is acceptable to the central staff and campuses.

Management and Use of Resources: For systems growing from a flagship campus, the same administrative structure often continues for the system as used previously for the management of the single campus. In these cases the number of front line officers to serve the system executive is likely to be too few, but conversely second and third level staff are likely to be excessive. This organization often has weaknesses in serving the system and is a managerial problem.

The Carnegie Commission gives emphasis to management development:

> ...increased emphasis on efforts to achieve more effective use of resources in institutions of higher education must be

> accompanied by increased concern with management development. However, management development programs as exemplified in private industry cannot be applied in the same manner in higher education.[53]

A general assumption exists in the minds of many that costs are related to degree programs offered. However, the cost of any degree program is determined by the sum of the cost of each course that constitutes the package leading to the degree. Cost of degrees are often reduced if given courses can be used in the package for many different degree programs. For example, numerous courses in arts and sciences are used in degree packages for majors in other areas. Examples can be given for advanced courses in mathematics and chemistry, where these are predominently populated by nonmajor students. By prorating the cost of these courses, on the basis of the major field of students enrolled in them, the results are likely to show that the degree program costs for major students in chemistry and mathematics are very low whether at the undergraduate or doctoral level. Other fields serving nonmajors may also have low incremental cost for degree programs for major students. Institutional research officers should make specific calculations of the cost of courses and allocate the proper component to each major program to which a course contributes.

Most authors clearly differentiate between duplication and replication. If the scale is adequate, duplication does not increase the student credit hour cost, however, replication does increase the student credit hour cost because of low enrollment in class resulting from offering special classes for which another might substitute.

Replication would result if two or more departments offered similar courses the same semester and the few available students were widely spread among the similar but competing courses. Good management of resources would require that some of the courses offered, for which there are fewer available students than needed to fully populate any one of them, be dropped and others offered during alternate semesters to allow a higher enrollment and a resulting lower unit cost.

Reduction in courses rather than degree programs in many arts and sciences departments is necessary to avoid replication. If other divisions on a campus make heavy use of arts and sciences courses rather than offering similar ones, not only can they diminish the cost of the arts and sciences courses, and degree programs depending on these courses, but also these other divisions would save much from courses they are not required to offer. Accordingly, the first action needed to utilize resources more effectively is to reduce the number of similar courses offered on any campus. The multiple use of courses in several degree program packages reduces the cost of all and some have a very low incremental cost.

A multicampus university has a special advantage as it can completely eliminate courses in a subspecialty on one campus and serve the students by (a) permitting them a semester on another campus having strength in the subspecialty or (b) asking professors from another campus in the system to teach once a week at a campus in need; probably every other semester would suffice. For example, one campus of the system may have advanced strength in biochemistry and another specialized capability in physical chemistry. Major students, from other areas also take courses offered on each campus, but the exchange of chemistry majors between campuses sustains quality and reduces cost of replication.

The Carnegie Commission states some of the problems of higher education today which confront the manager:

> The public interest in higher education is more intense. Higher education takes more of the resources of society.
>
> More families have a direct interest in how the campus conducts itself. It is more involved in local and national political affairs.[54]
>
> A general reduction in the acceptance of authority has marked many aspects of American society in recent years; so also on the campus.[55]

Lee and Bowen speak to the advantage of scale of the multicampus university:

> Finally, a multicampus university has advantages of economy of scale in admissions administration and data collection and analysis. From the standpoint of both the student and the campus, efficiencies should result from a centralized administration—a single applications procedure for several campuses, for example.
>
> Not only will the multicampus structure command a broader range of data, but it can have specialized personnel for its utilization.56

The following statement from the Carnegie Commission should allay the fear of the faculty member who feels that any management decision of a budget cut or reallocation of resources will destroy the university campus or system.

> What do we mean by more effective use of resources within higher education? Among other things we mean that an institution should (1) carefully analyze the relations between the use of resources and the accomplishment of goals, (2) seek maximum economies with minimal sacrifices in quality, and (3) encourage rapid and flexible adaptation to changes in needs for educational, research and public service programs.[56]
>
> We do not mean the expenses should be pruned regardless of the effects of such pruning on quality or on the scope of service.
>
> Economies can be achieved without sacrificing quality and many of the measures discussed

> in this report, such as changes in degree structures and elimination of overlapping and duplication of degree programs, e.g., in the health sciences, would achieve more economical use of resources without sacrifices in the quality of education.[57]
>
> Higher education should undertake internally the constructive actions necessary to get more effective use of resources and not wait for less constructive—and sometimes destructive—actions to be required because of external initiative.[58]

Few, if any institutions, are organized to achieve these recommendations, but the multicampus system is capable of realizing them and should give this evaluation a very high priority.

As emphasized in *The More Effective Uses of Resources*, the central program planning officer cannot expect new resources for all the new programs which he has discovered to be of great interest to the state. Rather than letting these pass, and allowing existing programs to remain unaltered, he is obligated to negotiate with the central academic officer on the reallocation of academic resources. Of course, final decisions will have to be made by the system executive.

The Carnegie Commission explains:

> More basically, funds must be found to develop new programs and expand existing programs in response to changing needs. In a period of budgetary stringency, this may well necessitate curtailing or dropping programs for which demand has declined or in which the institution has not developed great strength.[59]

Research and public service in universities require funding and their requirements must be balanced with the needs for resident instruction. This allocation problem is recognized by the Carnegie Commission:

> Research and public service have long been highly regarded functions of [land grant] universities, and, to some extent, of other

> institutions of higher education as well. In this country, we have relied very heavily on universities for both basic research and some applied research—in contrast with the situation in many European countries in which research is largely conducted in government-supported institutes outside the universities. We believe that the marriage of higher education and research as it has developed in this country has produced, in general, demonstrably superior results.[60]

Lee and Bowen report that in the systems they studied innovative techniques of resource allocation were almost nonexistent. Developing effective distribution requires the good leadership from the faculty, the central staff and campus officers. Innovative techniques of resource allocation are important not only for academic quality, but also because of the significant financial implications. About eighty percent of the campus budget is spent on faculty and staff salaries. The central academic affairs officer can contribute greatly to effective management through guidelines for tenure and promotion. Tenure awarded without merit is costly and judgments of merit are vital. When states have one board with each institutional head reporting directly to the board, much managerial and coordinating capability is lost in contrast to the multicampus system with an effective executive or a statewide consolidated board and a single executive.

Many writers have found that organization charts for most multicampus system are not too meaningful because of rapid changes in the maturing process. One example is the lack of specific power delegated from the state to the governing board. Also often omitted is a detailed delegation of faculty authorities. One has to conclude that nearly every multicampus system is seeking ways to improve its administrative structure and management techniques. These are most important to effective decision making and optimizing the potential of the multicampus system for effective utilization of resources. The multicampus system provides maximum opportunity for developing an optimum administrative structure for good management at all levels.

Chapter 9

NEW TRENDS

Introduction: As a reflection on Lee and Bowen's extensive study in 1970, Clark Kerr and William Friday expressed views of the future of the multicampus university on the basis of their experience as presidents of two of the country's oldest and most distinguished multicampus systems. Their remarks are so pertinent to this paper that extensive quotations are given in Appendix C.

Since publication of Lee and Bowen's book in 1970, North Carolina and Wisconsin have changed to consolidated statewide systems. Other states having independent institutions in 1970 have moved either to a multicampus system or to a statewide consolidated system. In 1970 most of the campuses of the University of California system were envisioned ultimately to achieve the Berkeley and UCLA models, but in 1973 enrollment projections for the newer campuses were significantly reduced, and the campus missions were directed toward diverse specialization rather than comprehensiveness.

Even at this early date it is agreed that Lee and Bowen were accurate in their forecast that the seventies would be the test for the multicampus university. The first four years of this decade are revealing that the basic foundations of the multicampus university are more broadly recognized than a decade ago, but that statewide consolidated systems may be the drama of the seventies that multicampus systems were of the sixties. In the present study of administrative structures, much similarity is seen between the structure needed for the statewide consolidated systems and for the large multicampus system.

It may be accurate to conclude that the concept and success of the multicampus systems have been sufficiently impressive that the legislatures and the public in many states want all of higher education governed as a cluster. The planned revision of Lee and Bowen's book will likely reveal that their arguments for coordination and planning are highly respected as more necessary today than in the sixties, but that the emphasis may be shifting from segmented multicampus systems to comprehensive systems or consolidated statewide systems.

Pennsylvania, Indiana and Kentucky are reported in this study as exceptions to this general trend. They are similar with each having at least one large university and satellite campuses, but administration is different from that of most states.

Coordination: A Task Force from the University of Missouri, chaired by Dr. Lynn Martin, conducted a study in the winter of 1971-72 on State Level Coordination and Governance of Higher Education. The states reviewed were selected to compare the effectiveness of different types of statewide coordination.

Two of these states contained multicampus systems studied by Lee and Bowen in 1969. The Missouri Task Force study was prompted by a state reorganization plan in Missouri which could affect the governance of the multicampus University of Missouri and the independent state colleges, now officially regional state universities.

> Concern over possible effects of these sweeping changes upon Missouri higher education generally, and the University of Missouri in particular, led University President C. Brice Ratchford to

> appoint a nine-member Task Force on State-Level Coordination and Governance of Higher Education. The Task Force assignment included: (1) identification of the methods used by the 50 states of the United States in their efforts to secure coordination of higher education on a statewide basis; (2) evaluation of the actual experience of these states in order to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each of the different coordinating mechanisms; and (3) application of these findings to the Missouri situation, so that recommendations could be made as to the coordinating structure(s) most likely to meet the needs of the state and its institutions of higher education.[61]

The unprecendented growth of resources to higher education in the late fifties and sixties required little attention to academic program planning for effective use of resources. Only limited public and legislative pressures were exerted toward strengthening the powers of the state coordinating agency to check replicated programs and over expansion of campus activities. President Ratchford and the University of Missouri Task Force saw that there could be an overreaction to the freedom of the sixties and that the proposed reorganization of State Government could result in strangling controls on the university.

> By contrast, the 1970s have thus far been a period of much harsher realities. Expansion of higher education facilities led to substantial increases in [total] costs; the kind of education produced came to be questioned more and more critically by students, the general public, and educators themselves. As recipients of advanced professional and graduate degrees--and in some occupational fields, even baccalaureate degrees--began to glut the job market

> and to compete desperately for scarce or non-existent jobs, there developed widespread concern over the extent to which there had been overexpansion and needless duplication of higher education programs.[62]

At the same time, the University Task Force recognized that the institutions themselves had a responsibility to serve the public better and simultaneously to utilize more effectively scarce resources for the most relevant programs. Weak coordination was also envisioned as a special danger in austere times, because independent institutions of a state may not be as cautious about the control of over commitments as the multicampus university system.

> Finally, there developed widespread concern both within and outside the university community as to whether institutions of higher education were themselves sufficiently responsive to new or emerging societal needs. Besides questioning the "relevance" of higher education, many of those having influence in state politics and government began to question the extent to which the colleges and universities were truly accountable to the people of the state for the effective use of public resources allocated to higher education. Both in the legislature and executive offices of state government, there developed a concern for the establishment of means for insuring orderly and rational distribution of these resources so as to meet statewide educational needs.
>
> In almost all states, three major issues have by now become paramount in the field of higher education: (1) how to orient programs so as to meet the needs of the state's whole system of higher education, rather than have policy defined by the outsome [sic] of competition among institutions that are largely attempting to advance their

> own separate, parochial interests; (2) how to create a system responsive to new needs, having capacity for change and innovation, without producing a levelling of institutional quality that will preclude desirable differentiation in institutional missions and programs; and (3) how to insure that the public colleges and universities efficiently utilize the resources made available to them. These concerns have led state policymakers to seek greater centralization of decision-making authority in higher education, in the hopes that further concentration of power will lead to greater responsiveness and accountability.[63]

Table 1 reported by the Task Force clearly shows the drastic change from little coordination in 1940 to a high degree of coordination in 1972.

Table 1

NUMBER OF STATES CLASSIFIED BY TYPE OF STATEWIDE STRUCTURE FOR COORDINATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION, FOR SELECTED YEARS, 1940-1972[64]

Type of Coordinating Structure	1940	1950	1960	1965	1970	1972
None	33	28	17	7	2	2
Voluntary	0	3	6	3	2	1
Advisory Coordinating Agency	1	1	5	11	13	13
Coordinating Agency with Regulatory Powers	1	2	6	12	14	13
Consolidated Governing Board	13	14	16	17	19	21
TOTAL	48	48	50	50	50	50

One forecast for the seventies is an increase in the number of states with consolidated governing boards. The unanswered questions are (a) How many consolidations will occur in existing multicampus universities being expanded to include all four year institutions in the state?, or even more comprehensive to include all postsecondary education?, (b) How many states with a consolidated board without a chief executive to whom all campus heads report will become multicampus systems with a system executive or a statewide consolidated system with a system executive?, and (c) How many states with advisory coordinating agencies and independent institutions will move to multicampus systems? It appears that many independent institutions of 1970 in states with advisory coordinating commissions have started branch or regional campuses which will expand into multicampus systems with a system executive and individual campus administrators within ten years.

For the seventies the necessity for more effective program planning and efficient utilization of resources is predicted. It is apparent that this is best achieved by (a) consolidated governing board for the state with an executive to whom all institutional heads report and (b) multicampus university systems as described by Lee and Bowen.[65] The University of Missouri Task Force describes the greater rigidity placed on the individual institutions by the consolidated board than would result from segmented multicampus systems as described by Lee and Bowen:

> The consolidated governing board is a vehicle for achieving the highest degree of centralization in program control, resource allocation, and long-range planning. Responsibility for the governance of higher education would be fixed in the one board. If jurisdiction extends to all public institutions, comprehensiveness of purview would be broad, except for the private sector.

> With such an approach, however, individual institutional influence and autonomy would be minimal and strong possibilities exist that desirable institutional diversity might be stifled. Individual institutional inputs could be lost in an extensive and expensive bureaucratic process. Likewise, the span of control of the governing board, in states with many institutions, could militate against effective administration, because members of the board would have neither the time nor knowledge of individual institutional problems and affairs to be able to make intelligent decisions. Lay representation is limited to the membership of the single consolidated board. The system has potential for minimizing state government intervention because of the absolute authority vested in the consolidated governing board.[66]

Also the Task Force reported:

> Theoretical considerations led the Task Force to believe that coordinating structures having greater centralization of power would perform appreciably better in the areas of long-range planning, program control, and resource allocation. Quite clearly, this turns out not to be true in the nine states that were examined in some detail for this study. Indeed, the evidence points very strongly to the conclusion that none of these nine state systems of higher education, no matter what the type of coordinating structure in use, has achieved any noteworthy overall success in terms of all three of these criteria.[67]

Chapter 10

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP REQUIRED

The freedom and quality of a multicampus university is best protected by an administrative structure that permits effective management in the six administrative areas described in Section III, Chapter 6. Coordination, planning and efficient resource utilization as demanded by the people and government of the state should simultaneously be achieved. If these goals are achieved the multicampus university can meet the needs of the seventies and this writer forecasts that it will do so. However, the consolidated statewide system may be better than a state with multicampus systems and an advisory coordination board not taking full advantage of their potentials and failing to provide statewide leadership.

The Carnegie Commission reports in late 1973 that:

> Priorities imply action, and a program of action, we believe, is needed. Action in what directions? We suggest:
>
> - Clarification of purpose
> - Preservation and enhancement of quality and diversity
> - Advancement of social justice
> - Enhancement of constructive change
> - Achievement of more effective governance
> - Assurance of resources and their more effective use[68]

Academic leadership is needed more than ever before to determine the best form of coordination and management for each state. In the past coordinating agencies have gained power to the detriment of higher education because only feeble efforts were made by education to discipline itself. Multicampus systems and advisory coordinating agencies can be mutually supportive, thereby benefiting both the public and education. If this cooperation does not occur, one board systems are the most logical solution:

> Academics, as well as the public, have a right-even a duty-to be concerned about changing purposes, and methods used in carrying them out.
>
> Higher education should take the initiative in determing its own future.[69]

Diversity of educational institutions is necessary to meet the public needs. Elite institutions should be encouraged and maintained as a source of scholarship and leadership training at the highest levels. Such institutions should be given special attention and resources for research and instruction of our best graduate students. Better policies can build quality within resources available.[70] The Carnegie Commission offers sage advice:

> To obtain greater public support needed in the future—higher education must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the public that its purposes are essential, governance is effective and makes good use of available resources.
>
> The real achievements lie with those who act effectively.
>
> They [states] ...must be prepared to spend an average of about 1.0 percent of per capita income on state support of higher education for the rest of the decade, as compared with an estimated 1972-73 figure of about 0.90, if the new students still coming along are to be accommodated,[in more expensive programs.]
>
> We do not believe that higher education will decline and we are convinced that it would be a tragedy for the nation if it did.[71]

Salaries and fringe benefits will have to increase to attract and maintain quality faculty. This requires the best of academic administration and an awareness by the faculty of what the students and public expect in return. Every unit of each campus of a multicampus university should analyze expenditures in the several different categories and establish a priority for each of these. A saving of energy for heating and cooling can not only help solve the energy crisis, but possibly ultimately be used for salary increases, more books for the library or updated laboratory equipment. In 1972-73, the University of Missouri - Rolla quoted the budget for fuel and utilities at the beginning of the year in the faculty bulletin with a commitment that any savings would be used for library books and laboratory equipment. This proved to be an effective incentive for conservation as the saving was ten percent of the budgeted amount.

Duplication of services between the central offices and the counterpart offices on the campuses can be eliminated in a multicampus system. The saving can then be used for higher priority academic needs. This ultimately results in savings to the taxpayer and better quality of education. Travel, leaves and research appointments for faculty may be considered of low priority by legislators and taxpayers, but the administration and faculty together must be prepared to document the low cost/high benefit ratio made possible by these fringe benefits.

Success in motivating students to exercise more care for facilities can reduce custodial and maintenance cost. The faculty should have a voice in how the savings can fund high priority needs of the academic interests, but the administration must demonstrate to legislators the capability of the multicampus system for effective utilization of resources. High priority educational needs must be funded in the seventies and to compensate for the slow increase in state support to meet inflation, every possible method of conservation not injurious to quality must be employed.

Income from outside sources must be pursued diligently and this gain can make the difference between just existing and sustaining quality with some growth in high priority areas. Educators and leaders of multicampus systems must not succumb to gloom in the seventies but demonstrate the potential efficiencies of the systems. Problems can be overcome and progress made through good leadership and cooperation as the system has the potential for both quality and efficiency over competing independent campuses. The Carnegie Commission reported in Priorities For Action that the Federal Government should match the proposed amounts from the states. If realized this combined support, although less than desired by educators, will permit higher education to progress in America. The seventies are a greater challenge to education than the sixties.

SECTION SUMMARY

The basic elements of administration at all levels of a multicampus system, in structure, practice and capability of personnel are all very important to the system in achieving its potential. Important contributions to internal governance ranging from the board through faculty committees provide the team effort necessary for success. This team effort requires an enlightened governing board concerned with policy, a central executive with strong educational and managerial ability, an adequate number of capable central front line staff to serve the system executive in all basic administrative areas, shared responsibility with well qualified campus executives and staffs and an organizational structure permitting faculty input to decisions in the academic realm at all levels. Of course, communication with students is always vital.

The board must formulate policy and goals; well documented recommendations from the system executive are absolutely necessary for good board action. The central executive must rely on his basic front line staff to research issues of interest to him and the board and all of the officers must give the executive accurate data and objective evaluations. They confidently substantiate their recommendations to the central executive.

The board must understand the problems, ambitions and missions of each campus and this requires that members individually or collectively visit the campuses frequently and know the key personnel there. Board meetings are considered most productive if the business and social aspects are strictly separate. Campus visits and social functions are important, but should be divorced from the business meetings of the board.

Only the system executive should attend the board meetings as the regular interface between the board and management. Members of the central staff and campus executives should attend only upon the invitation of the system executive and many reports would suggest that he invite these officers only if they have expertise to contribute to the particular agenda under consideration. Board committees are often used but a vice-president or vice-chancellor should not be asked to staff a given committee on a regular basis. The system executive is the appropriate one to serve each committee, but at times he will need to delegate this to one of his cabinet officers or a personal staff member because of schedule conflicts. The officer to whom this is delegated should understand that he is temporarily representing the system executive.

All members of the university family should know the internal channels of communications and must be aware that the board is the final authority in the governance of the institution. Boards have lost power in recent years to external coordinating agencies, but they continue as the most influential voice in the governance of the multicampus systems. The board has the authority to allocate resources among campuses and to approve or reject new program proposals. Boards also hire the system executives and in many systems approve or reject his recommendations for appointments of front line staff officers and campus executives.

Boards must protect the rights of the institution from political influence of state or federal agencies. Unless the board has control of all institutions in the state, it must speak with a strong voice to protect the interest of the system which it governs in relationship to the state coordinating agency. Faculty control of strictly academic matters should be guaranteed by the board. The governing board is the best possible buffer between the institution and society.

The system executive performs in a narrow range of implementing board policy and supporting the documented recommendations of his campus and staff executives. He indeed faces a sensitive role because of the differences that he may have to reconcile between the board and the campuses to serve the university best. The system executive has great demands on his time because he is the person expected to relate directly with the board, coordinating agency, other state agencies, the legislature and the governor; he also performs selected ceremonial duties. His front line staff may assist in some areas, but he cannot delegate responsibilities when he is personally expected to perform particular duties by influential people, groups and agencies. He must also reserve time for group and individual meetings with his campus executives and front line staff. Because of these demands he requires an adequate number of well qualified executive staff members to serve him in each important administrative area. His campus executives must keep him well informed of the activities and needs of the campuses. His central executive staff members are also expected to be knowledgeable of campus activities and needs in their respective functions.

The system executive must be an educational leader as well as a good administrator. He and the board have the responsibility of protecting the academic well being of the system against harassing external influences and for obtaining reasonable financial support for the institution. Because of the pressure on the system executive and the monumental expectations of the faculty for his accomplishments, term appointments rather than indefinite appointment periods are suggested by some experienced educators. Such arrangements would be equally valid for system and campus executives. The faculty properly desire that administrators assume office from among their ranks. It is therefore somewhat surprising that former colleagues often make unrealistic demands on executives by failing to recognize pressures and restraints exerted upon them.

To alleviate the pressure on the system executive and to inform him in specific administrative areas of the system, at least the following basic front line executive officers are needed: (a) administration, (b) academic affairs, (c) business and finance, (d) program planning (with academic expertise), (e) university relations and (f) university counsel. Although the administrative officers for some systems can execute matters not falling within any defined functional category, executives in other systems find that another cabinet level officer is needed to assume responsibility for scattered but important matters.

The position of executive vice-president or vice-chancellor appears ill advised since it can insulate the system executive from his campus leaders and executive central staff. Where a moderate to large number of campuses are in a system, the California organizational plan seems effective, while for smaller systems the vice-president of the university appears unnecessary. For very large systems of wide campus diversity, a vice-president or vice-chancellor, representing each cluster of institutions, reporting directly to the system executive, along with basic front line officers, is a solution. Campus interviews and references all urge that the system executive maintain as close an association with his campus executives as possible. This thinking discourages the move for an executive vice-president or vice-chancellor.

Each central executive officer should have academic experience at the various ranks to serve effectively. Possible exceptions are the business-finance and university relations officers. In many systems even these positions are filled by persons with significant and successful academic experience. If the California organizational format is employed, strong evidence indicates that the vice-president of the university should have excellent academic training and a wide variety of academic experiences.

Almost all university system executives prefer that their cabinet level central officers be selected from a broad range of backgrounds and that they have academic and administrative experience at different universities or campuses within the system. These officers usually do not need large staffs because operations should be delegated as much as possible to the campuses. The central staff, however, must study the facts and make recommendations to the system executive for important policy and academic matters. These include resource allocation, degree programs, campus missions, program quality and program planning. Replication of courses and programs must be avoided if resources available to the system are to be used effectively.

Federal contacts concerning projects should be delegated to the campuses. A front line central officer, or the system executive, should establish Washington contacts to be able to forecast the impact on the university of changing government relations. Federal contacts are a shared responsibility between the campuses and the system.

The basis for internal allocation of resources should be determined centrally with inputs from central staff, campus authorities and faculty. The best system is a combination of a formula component and a discretionary supplement which is negotiated between the campus executive and system executive. Allocations should be determined by the needs of the state and the missions of the respective campuses.

University relations encompass both internal and external communications, but the external efforts must be low key.

Neither the public nor the legislature feel that the university system needs to advertise.

Most systems have delegated the administration of extension and research management to the campuses with only a coordinating role retained by the central administration. A few historical exceptions are noted for extension but most of these are being restudied in view of experience of successful delegation. The campus executive and campus deans should consider extension and research their responsibilities just as much as resident instruction. All three are academic functions if implemented by the faculty. The central academic affairs officer may need to serve as a catalyst to stimulate the proper balance and allocation of faculty time among these three academic efforts on each campus.

The governance of the campus is largely delegated to the campus administrators and faculty. The campus executive, like the system executive, also occupies a very sensitive role in being responsible for implementing the policies of the system executive, striving for diversification and cooperation among campuses and simultaneously supporting the rational needs of his deans and faculty. The division of responsibility between the campus and system at all levels should be clearly understood by everyone. One of the great challenges to the campus executive is to convince his faculty that advantages of the system far more than outweigh the inherent disadvantage of important decisions being made further from those at the campus level.

Achieving effective use of faculty time is an important campus responsibility that has barely been explored. This can contribute remarkably to the efficient use of resources. To encourage campus executives, deans, department chairpersons and faculty to move in this direction the chief academic affairs officer should establish desired guidelines, and campuses are expected to respond appropriately.

Campus executives need an adequate administrative staff above the deans' level for effective management. Because of the shared responsibility concept between the campuses and the central office the total cost of administration should be less than if each campus were separately administered. The campus administration must work with formal faculty bodies and informal faculty groups to assure them that the system does not erode the academic authority normally enjoyed on independent campuses. Furthermore, the campus executive and his staff have to be engaged actively in explaining the value of the system to the faculty and seeking ways for the campus faculties to have collective input at the central office level. Each campus executive will have a highly qualified academic affairs officer and must be willing for this officer to work closely with the chief academic officer at the central level. The central academic affairs officer in turn will make sound recommendations to the system executive about the role of the faculty in decision making. Faculty groups are undecided about the desirability of an all university senate, or appropriate substitutes. The central officers' counterparts on each campus and faculty leaders should be able to resolve the present uncertainties. However, small systemwide faculty groups working closely with the system executive seem more effective than systemwide senates.

The campus executive should appoint members of his staff as contact officers for each of the basic executive staff of the central office. Each central executive officer must communicate with his campus counterpart and faculty contacts. Such communication channels bring campus opinions to the system executive as a supplement to his interactions with the campus executives. This flow of information is especially valuable to campus administrators and the faculties since it prompts campus inputs into program changes, budgeting, and facilities priorities.

Campus executives are somewhat reluctant to encourage faculty participation at the central level just as system executives do not always approve of faculty and deans participation in advisory councils of statewide coordinating commissions. Most experienced educational administrators would agree that mature faculty inputs are good at both levels; this study supports needs for encouraging faculty opinions.

Just as governing boards often fail to have clearly defined authority, it should not bother faculty if details of their authority are not specific; this will be sharpened as the system matures. Faculty authority at the central level is much more difficult to specify for systems with campuses of widely different academic levels than for those consisting of similar institutions. Collective bargaining by faculty on some campuses can drastically change the traditional role of faculty governance whether on an independent campus or a part of a multicampus system.

Students are much more concerned about campus decisions than central ones. The campus executive must have a qualified student personnel executive to work with student organizations and individual students. This officer should be interested in student opinions on central and campus administration. Counseling services should be available to serve all students and give attention to the special needs of minority students. The campus placement officer should keep the admissions director as well as freshmen and sophomore students well informed of the shifting job market. The system executive and/or the central academic affairs officer could profit by holding periodic rap sessions on each campus for students and faculty. Quality of student academic programs should be a concern of the central academic affairs officer just as faculty liaison is a primary duty. The student personnel office and the counseling center would be his campus contacts for the students in addition to student leaders. Students make important contributions in departmental level decisions and these reports should be dispatched by the chairperson through channels to all interested parties, as these can influence decisions at the campus, central and board levels.

Alumni loyalty is to the campus and cultivation is primarily a campus responsibility. Alumni from all campuses may be organized to help the system executive and the central university relations officer promote the university, especially the budget. Representative groups can assist the central program planning officer in his external assessment of how well the total university is serving the groups and individuals in the state who finance it through their taxes. Although the student is the primary beneficiary of public higher education, he pays only a fraction of the cost. The taxpayers who make up the difference are entitled to express their opinions on how their money is being spent.[72]

Decision making is complex in the multicampus system because of the various levels of managements, and the many groups with which each level interacts. Most authorities feel that decisions of the multicampus university should be made at the lowest possible level, and their opinion is substantiated by this study. If the campus executives, deans and faculty are given extensive authority in a liberal decentralized plan for operation they must be accountable for their actions when evaluated. Most reports encourage highly decentralized operations except where scale improves the cost/benefit ratio if performed centrally. Some systems give flexibility to policy implementation in order to serve the needs of a particular campus. It is important that the campus officers be held responsible for the decentralized components of the shared work load between campus and central offices.

The result of a national survey on the existing and desired degree of decentralization, and level of decision making, for twenty-four components of administration are discussed in the next section. Advantages of decentralization discussed in Section III are substantiated by the survey.

Decision making levels in a comprehensive multicampus system are quite complex as more diverse institutions are represented here than in a segmented system. Some single state consolidated systems function more like a segmented multicampus system than do some comprehensive mutlicampus systems. For example, the consolidated Florida system is much like the Missouri system in determining where decisions should be made and who makes them.

Many management structures have been used for multicampus systems and most seem to have evolved from historical factors rather than being carefully designed to meet the needs of the system. Management structures often move up to the system level from the flagship campus and most of these have too few top level people to serve each important distinctive requirement. The size of the second and third level staff may be more than needed. This occurs because as campus officers they were concerned with operations and procedures while at the system level they should be primarily fact finding and coordinating officers. Managers at the system level must have a different perspective from those at the campuses, and system officers do not need as many assistants as do operational officers at the campus level. Management development programs designed to meet the needs of the system are highly desirable.

It is not unusual for former campus administrators from nonacademic areas to view cost as directly related to degree programs offered while the fundamental consideration is the cost of each course in the package leading to a particular degree. If replication is to be avoided, each course in each degree program must be analyzed separately. If the same course is used in several packages leading to different degrees, this is an efficiency measure. In a few cases many courses are used in several packages leading to a degree and the incremental cost of some degree programs is almost nil. Degree cost may be prohibitive if too many courses can be used only in a package for one program.

A multicampus system has a special advantage in being able to offer courses in one subdiscipline on one campus and another subdiscipline package on a different campus. Either professors or students can be exchanged occasionally so that the combined offering is available to students at either campus at a minimum cost. At the advanced level, this plan also eliminates duplication of expensive equipment. Special equipment on any one campus must be made available to faculty and students from other campuses. This enables specialization and cooperation which are essential to the concept of multicampus organization.

Academic planning is most important to achieve these efficient utilizations of resources. The campus executive and central officers must cooperate to effect the efficiencies expected by the taxpaying public. The central academic officer and faculty should be overseers of academic quality. Improved efficiency does not hurt quality if methods are well planned. No public institution has the resources to do everything for everybody, but the sum of the total assets of the specialized and diversified campuses can indeed render impressive services, yet be efficient.

A single university may have to eliminate a program completely when some of its limited resources are desired to start new studies required by changing societal needs. For example, geological engineering may be considered by a curriculum committee to be less important to society than environmental engineering. A multicampus system has the advantage of sharing a program between two campuses and utilizing the savings to start an urgently needed new program. No loss of quality occurs by dividing the discipline into subdisciplines if the participating campuses cooperate by occasionally moving students and faculty between the two.

A balance of resources among resident teaching, research and nonresident teaching is vital to good public support and all three are important program components of the university center level institution. Balancing these by the system is urgent, but not all campuses have to give equal emphasis to each. As a general rule residential campuses give more attention to research than nonresidential ones, while urban institutions concentrate on continuing education.

In the seventies some multicampus systems are likely to be incorporated into a statewide system with a single executive and one governing board; this will eliminate the state coordinating agency. Many currently independent institutions will be clustered into multicampus systems and some will be absorbed by a statewide system with one executive and one board. States now having one coordinating and governing board with the campus executives reporting directly to the board, or through their institutional boards, present the most difficult case for which to forecast changes for the future.

Good coordination serves as a buffer between political interests and the institutions and is important to the welfare of the institutions. Too rigid coordination, or governance, deprives the institutions of sufficient autonomy to be responsible for their appropriate missions. Leadership will be required at all levels of influence to reach this proper balance of coordination. Weak coordination can scatter resources so thinly that no institution in the state can achieve, or sustain, quality while inflexible coordination can strangle the best institution in the state so that the only way it can go is downward.

In states now having one or more multicampus university systems, effectiveness of these systems can be the key to their future. If they are strong, and only then, can they have a significant influence on actions of the state legislatures proposing change. Grouping institutions in a state which are not members of an existing university system into a segmental second system is most likely to be beneficial. Conversely, if the multicampus university system were asked to encompass institutions of a different character, the university system should be sufficiently strong to influence a "no" vote if this is the choice. If a "yes" vote seemed desirable the university should be able to write the terms of the merger legislation and assure different missions for institutions in each category.

The University of Missouri Task Force on State-Level Coordination of Higher Education in early 1972 found significant weaknesses in all of the coordination bodies which they studied. Any form of coordination infringes on campus autonomy, ranging from the central administration of a multicampus university, or its board, to a consolidated system with a statewide governing board. Yet without some viable coordination of all institutions in the state, scarce resources of the seventies will be unwisely used to the detriment of all.

Multicampus systems and a strong but flexible advisory coordination board seems to offer the best potential for achieving optimum management of higher education for average size and larger states. Higher education would seem best served and the public receive the best cost/benefit ratios by creating segmented multicampus systems, clusters of homogeneous institutions in the state, with the systems appropriately coordinated by an advisory agency.

Because resources were reasonably plentiful during the sixties neither the efficiency of campuses nor statewide planning was of high priority. With the scarce resources of the seventies planning will have to be given high priority at all levels. Annual reviews are invaluable in these planning processes. Good planning starts at the least centralized level and is reviewed and possibly revised as it moves up to the state level. Hopefully, the campus, the system and the statewide coordinating agency will perform so well that the legislature will not take exceptions.

The final report of the Carnegie Commission in late 1973 projects a good future for higher education and maintenance of quality above the average in some institutions. Higher education must demonstrate to the public its viability, self discipline, ability to adjust to changing needs and translate these into action. Then we can expect federal and state support that will collectively approach the two percent of the per capita income of the states suggested by the Commission as being a reasonable expectation for the financial support for higher education. The seventies will be challenging and progress will be more difficult for educators, but advancements can be made if advantage is taken of every available opportunity.

References

[1] Baldridge, *Academic Governance*, p. 116—Henderson states the practice of the president to have members of his cabinet attend board meetings is commendable if it is clear that these officers are present at his request to render expert advice to him in connection with his responsibility to the board.

[2] Epstein, p. 77.

[3] Carnegie Commission, *Capitol*, p. 24.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[5] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 11.

[6] Epstein, p. 94.

[7] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 32.

[8] Baldridge, *Academic Governance*, p. 116.

[9] Epstein, p. 91.

[10] *Ibid.*,

[11] Lee and Bowen, p. 447.

[12] Baldridge, *Academic Governance*, pp. 98-121.

[13] *Ibid.*,

[14] Lee and Bowen, p. 141.

[15] Perry and Hull,

[16] Baldridge, p. 114.

[17] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 1.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[19] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 37.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[21] Lee and Bowen, p. 448.

[22] Lee and Bowen, p. xv-xvi.

[23] Edward H. Litchfield, "Journal of Higher Education," in *Academic Governance*, ed. by J. Victor Baldridge,(McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkeley, 1971),

[24] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 23.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 103. For private universities, each college has to be financed through its own promotional efforts.

[27] Lee and Bowen, pp. 216-453.

[28] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 23.

[29] Lee and Bowen

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

[31] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 6.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[33] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 81.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[35] Epstein, p. 113.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 126.

[37] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 86.

[38] Epstein, pp. 230-231.

[39] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*,

[40] Lee and Bowen, p. 57.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 188 and 189.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

[43] Carnegie Commission, *Governance*, p. 51.

[44] Carnegie Commission, *Effective Uses of Resources*, p. 23.

[45] Carnegie Commission, Governance, p. 69.

[46] Ibid.,

[47] Baldridge, p. 89.

[48] Lee and Bowen, p. xv.

[49] Ibid., p. xii.

[50] Baldridge, pp. 65 and 66.

[51] Lee and Bowen, p. 439.

[52] Ibid., p. 448.

[53] Carnegie Commission, Effective Uses of Resources, p. 219.

[54] Carnegie Commission, Governance, p. 9.

[55] Ibid., p. 9.

[56] Carnegie Commission, Effective Uses of Resources, p. 1.

[57] Ibid., p. 1.

[58] Ibid., p. 152

[59] Ibid., p. 73.

[60] Ibid., p. 73

[61] Task Force on State-Level Coordination and Governance of Higher Education, The Report to the President of the University of Missouri, (July 1972), p. 2.

[62] Ibid., p. 3.

[63] Ibid., pp. 3 and 4.

[64] Ibid., p. 4.

[65] Ibid., p. 4.

[66] Missouri Task Force, Report to the President, pp. 10 and 12.

[67] Ibid., p. 51.

[68] Priorities for Action—Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973),

[69] Priorities for Action, p.

[70] Ibid., p.

[71] Ibid., p.

[72] Merl Wilson Baker, Duke University Student Task Force on the Financing of Higher Education, (1974), pp. 20-35.

Section IV: Statistical Analysis of Degree of Centralization Desired

Chapter 11

DESCRIPTION OF DATA REQUESTED

Appendix A and B show a sample of the initial letter to system executives and a five part questionaire. The questionaire had four purposes: (a) serve as explanatory background material for planned future visits, (b) secure opinions describing the type of institution, (c) determine title of the respondents and (d) establish an opinion rating of twenty-four areas of administration. The system or campus executive was asked to complete a form and also to select others to respond. All of the evaluators who had been to the University of Missouri as a part of Dr. Paul Nagel's program evaluation were sent a copy.

Many of the individuals called or wrote explaining that they did not feel adequately familiar with the shared responsibility concept between the central administration and campuses to respond. Some of the institutional heads with a very limited number of branch or satellite campuses also asked to be excused from responding because their institution did not conform sufficiently to the pattern described to supply significant details needed. A total of two hundred and fifty-five forms were returned from a wide cross section of respondents.

The letter and survey proved to be especially helpful in informing participants of objectives prior to visits. The type of responses, or the lack of them, aided in eliminating many systems from further study. Letters accompanying the completed forms were helpful in assessing the maturity of the institution in becoming a multicampus system. Dr. John Hamblen was most helpful in establishing the computer program for analysis of the data received.

Chapter 12

ANALYSIS OF DATA

I. Of the persons reporting, 82.0 percent were from institutions granting the doctorate degree, while 14.5 percent were from campuses offering less than the doctorate. Only 3.5 percent failed to identify the type of their institution.

The type of governance of the institutions is distributed as follows:

A. 9.4 percent were from institutions governed by one executive and one board for the entire state.

B. 63.1 percent were from multicampus universities governed by one executive and a single board but not encompassing all institutions in the state.

C. 8.6 percent were from institutions with one board but separate administrative heads in the state reporting to the board.

D. 12.5 percent were from single institutions with individual boards, but some had branch or regional campuses.

E. 4.3 percent were from other types and only 2 percent failed to classify the type of governance of their institution.

II. The distribution between campus and central university administrators is 27.5 percent from the central administration, 66.7 percent from the campus while 5.9 percent failed to give their status. Possibly some of these had dual responsibilities.

The ratings of the campus officers of the twenty-four items of question V, with regard to degree of centralization, were compared with the ratings of central officers. No attempt was made to obtain an equal number in each category as most respondents were chosen by their system executive or campus executive. The greater number of campus respondents than central staff members is expected as the number of campus officers in multicampus systems are more numerous than those on central staffs. The tables show the views of each group. The opinion of respondents from campuses compared to those from central offices is shown, and the differences in the means of the preferred degree of centralization is not as great as speculated by many. In fact, the two groups are in close agreement on many items.

III. The title distribution of the respondents is as follows:

   A. 15.7 percent chief administrative officers, presidents or chancellors
   B. 18.0 percent were vice-presidents
   C. 11.8 percent were vice-chancellors or provosts
   D. 6.7 percent were other campus officers
   E. 23.9 percent were deans
   F. 11.4 percent were department chairmen
   G. 4.7 percent were professors
   H. 0.4 percent were elected alumni officials
   I. 5.1 percent were other central officers
   J. 2.4 percent did not identify with any of the above

IV. The size of the institutions represented by the respondents are:

   A. 31.0 percent from those above 20,000
   B. 5.1 percent from those between 15,000 and 19,999
   C. 7.1 percent from those between 10,000 and 14,999
   D. 53.7 percent from those below 10,000
   E. 3.1 percent did not identify size of institution

Table 1. shows the percentage distribution of the ratings of all respondents for the twenty-four items according to the following five point scale:

1. Complete responsibility of the individual campuses.
2. Responsibility of each campus with central administration having limited responsibility.
3. Nearly equally shared responsibility between the campuses and central administration.
4. Responsibility of central administration with individual campuses having limited responsibility.
5. Complete responsibility of central administration.

Row A is where the responsibility currently lies and Row B indicates where the responsibility would be preferred to lie.

TABLE 1.

Percentage Distribution Among All Respondents

ITEM*		1	2	3	4	5	No Response	
1. Ac. Ext.	A	27.8	39.2	14.9	9.8	1.2	7.1	(Is)
	B	27.8	43.9	12.9	5.1	2.4	7.8	(Preferred)
2. As. Ser.	A	16.5	21.2	16.5	15.7	4.7	25.5	
	B	14.9	23.9	18.8	12.5	3.5	26.3	
3. Acctng.	A	14.1	22.0	21.6	25.5	9.0	7.8	
	B	15.3	32.9	20.8	13.3	5.1	8.6	
4. Admsns.	A	40.4	41.6	5.9	5.1	2.4	4.7	
	B	39.2	42.4	9.0	2.7	2.0	4.7	
5. Alm.Rel.	A	48.2	23.9	5.9	10.2	4.7	7.1	
	B	47.1	25.5	9.4	7.8	3.5	6.7	
6. Athletic	A	60.8	20.8	0.4	6.3	4.7	7.1	
	B	56.9	23.1	2.4	6.3	3.5	7.8	
7. Bgt.Alc.	A	12.2	14.5	22.4	28.6	15.3	7.1	
	B	15.7	28.6	24.3	14.5	8.6	8.2	
8. Bgt.Ctr.	A	16.9	26.3	21.2	21.6	6.7	7.5	
	B	23.9	33.7	18.8	11.0	4.7	7.8	
9. Ctrt.Ad.	A	17.3	27.8	14.9	15.3	13.7	11.0	
	B	25.5	32.9	11.0	9.8	9.4	11.4	
10. Fd.Gt.Rl.	A	16.9	21.6	17.3	17.6	11.8	14.9	
	B	18.0	25.9	18.8	14.9	8.6	13.7	
11. Fd. Serv.	A	55.3	16.1	6.3	5.5	4.7	12.2	
	B	58.8	18.8	3.1	3.5	3.9	11.8	

---

[*] See Appendix B for complete title descriptions

TABLE 1. (continued)

Percentage Distribution Among All Respondents

ITEM		1	2	3	4	5	No Response	
12. Fnd.Rsg.	A	36.1	23.1	9.4	15.3	7.1	9.0	(Is)
	B	32.9	26.7	18.0	9.0	4.3	9.0	(Preferred)
13. Grd.Sch.	A	34.9	29.0	9.4	6.3	10.6	9.8	
	B	36.9	30.2	8.6	7.8	7.1	9.4	
14. Ac. Prog.	A	12.2	24.7	23.9	19.2	13.3	6.7	
	B.	16.9	38.0	25.5	8.2	4.7	6.7	
15. Fac.Ipts.	A	30.6	23.9	22.4	11.0	1.6	10.6	
	B	31.0	27.8	26.3	3.9	0.4	10.6	
16. Prsnel.	A	24.3	30.6	20.0	11.4	6.7	7.1	
	B	31.0	37.6	16.1	5.5	3.1	6.7	
17. Phy.Plt.	A	31.0	29.8	13.7	11.0	5.1	9.4	
	B	36.1	36.9	8.6	5.9	3.1	9.4	
18. Planing	A	11.8	22.0	32.5	20.0	6.7	7.1	
	B	13.3	35.3	29.8	10.2	3.9	7.5	
19. Nw.Bldgs.	A	11.4	12.5	25.1	27.5	16.1	7.5	
	B	14.5	23.9	32.2	14.5	7.5	7.5	
20. Pb.Sr.Ext.	A	26.7	22.7	15.3	8.6	6.3	20.4	
	B	27.8	27.8	11.8	7.5	3.9	21.2	
21. Pub.Info.	A	26.3	29.8	20.8	9.4	5.5	8.2	
	B	27.8	33.3	21.6	5.1	4.3	7.8	
22. Prching.	A	20.8	29.8	18.8	13.3	7.8	9.4	
	B	24.7	40.4	13.3	7.8	3.9	9.8	
23. Ten/Pro.	A	25.5	35.3	17.6	8.6	7.5	5.5	
	B	31.0	35.7	16.1	7.5	3.9	5.9	
24. Resrch.	A	17.3	19.6	9.0	7.1	8.2	38.8	
	B	20.4	22.7	8.2	3.5	5.5	39.6	

In Table 1. it is clear that moving from left to right is an increasing degree of centralization. It is noted that the degree of desirable centralization among the twenty-four areas described varies widely.

Table 2. shows the first and second order of frequency of the predominent title of the officer directly responsible for each of the twenty-four items. One problem with this question is the interchange in the use of vice-chancellor or vice-president from campus to system positions. Visits showed that most systemwide titles, except president or chancellor, were not descriptive of duties. Campus titles were more descriptive of duties, but in campus reports some differences are also noted for these. The following titles were anticipated for coding purposes:

1. Vice-President for Administration
2. Vice-President for Academic Affairs
3. Vice-President for Business
4. Vice-President for Planning
5. Vice-President for University Relations
6. Vice-President for Government Relations
7. Vice-President
8. Other central officers
9. Other campus officer
10. No Response

It is significant in Table 2 that a campus officer appears frequently and a central officer infrequently. The "no response" percentage was often the first or second most frequent predominent opinion, and this suggests a wide variation in the opinions of the respondents of the position predominently responsible for a given administrative function.

TABLE 2.

TITLE OF OFFICER LISTED
MOST FREQUENTLY FOR EACH COMPONENT

	First	Second
1.	Other Campus Officer	Other Central Officer
2.	No Response	Other Campus Officer
3.	Other Campus Officer	Other Central Officer
4.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
5.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
6.	Other Campus Officer	No Response

TABLE 2. (continued)
TITLE OF OFFICER LISTED MOST FREQUENTLY FOR EACH COMPONENT

	First	Second
7.	Other Central Officer	Other Campus Officer
8.	Other Campus Officer	Other Central Officer
9.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
10.	No Response	Other Campus Officer
11.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
12.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
13.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
14.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
15.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
16.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
17.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
18.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
19.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
20.	No Response	Other Campus Officer
21.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
22.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
23.	Other Campus Officer	No Response
24.	No Response	Other Campus Officer

Table 3. shows the mean for the degree of centralization measured on the one to five scale, with one being totally decentralized and five totally centralized. This table is for all respondents including campus and central. The first column of the table gives the mean ratings as the respondents now believe prevail, the second is their preferred and the third column is the difference between the mean of column one and column two.

All items, except 6(Direction of Athletics) show a preference for less centralization. However, the difference is not statistically significant in many cases. Those items that are statistically significant and preferring less centralization than now exists are these: 3(Accounting), 7(Budgetary Allocation), 8(Budgetary Control), 9(Contract Administration), 14(New Academic Programs), 16(Nonacademic Personnel), 18(Planning), 19(Priority for New Buildings) and 22(Purchasing).

TABLE 3.

Mean Degree of Centralization
Total Responses

	Is	Preferred	Difference
1.	2.384	2.337	.047
2.	3.475	3.447	.028
3.	3.169	2.820	.349*
4.	2.016	2.000	.016
5.	2.204	2.153	.051
6.	1.945	2.000	-.055
7.	3.416	2.965	.451*
8.	2.973	2.624	.349*
9.	3.133	2.788	.345*
10.	3.306	3.114	.192
11.	2.247	2.102	.145
12.	2.612	2.522	.090
13.	2.580	2.463	.117
14.	3.169	2.659	.510*
15.	2.608	2.467	.141
16.	2.667	2.322	.345*
17.	2.576	2.314	.262
18.	3.090	2.784	.306*

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

TABLE 3. (continued)

Mean Degree of Centralization
Total Responses

	Is	Preferred	Difference
19.	3.467	2.988	.479*
20.	3.063	2.953	.110
21.	2.627	2.482	.145
22.	2.859	2.553	.306*
23.	2.537	2.353	.184
24.	3.859	3.698	.161

Table 4. shows a comparison of the mean degree of centralization between campus opinion and central officer respondents. Columns one, two and three are for campus respondents and columns four, five and six are for central officer respondents. The same scale is used as for Table 3.

The central officers preferred more centralization for all items except 22(Purchasing), but the differences between preferred and existing is not statistically significant for any item. The conclusion is that the central officers feel that they have almost achieved their wishes for the degree of centralization desired.

The campus respondents preferred less centralization than now exists in all but 6(Athletics), which they prefer more. This difference is not statistically significant, however. Those items for which the campus respondents prefer less centralization that are statistically significant are: 3(Accounting), 7(Budgetary Allocation), 8(Budgetary Control), 9(Contract Administration), 10(Federal Government Relations), 14(New Academic Programs), 16(Non-academic Personnel), 17(Physical Plant), 18(Planning), 19(Priority for New Buildings), 22(Purchasing) and 23(Tenure and Promotion).

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

TABLE 4.

Mean Degree of Centralization

	All Campus Officers			All Central Officers		
	Is	Preferred	Difference	Is	Preferred	Difference
1.	2.224	2.094	.130	2.557	2.757	.200
2.	3.424	3.347	.077	3.543	3.686	.143
3.	3.112	2.588	.524*	3.343	3.386	.043
4.	1.859	1.765	.094	2.229	2.443	.214
5.	1.859	1.759	.100	2.671	2.757	.086
6.	1.741	1.800	-.059	2.143	2.229	.086
7.	3.400	2.735	.665*	3.471	3.486	.015
8.	2.924	2.400	.524*	3.100	3.171	.071
9.	2.959	2.453	.506*	3.443	3.486	.043
10.	3.206	2.835	.371*	3.500	3.700	.200
11.	2.241	2.012	.229	2.086	2.143	.057
12.	2.394	2.206	.188	2.886	3.100	.214
13.	2.306	2.071	.235	3.014	3.157	.143
14.	3.024	2.312	.712*	3.286	3.214	.072
15.	2.406	2.182	.224	2.843	2.914	.071
16.	2.671	2.153	.518*	2.643	2.686	.043
17.	2.612	2.200	.412*	2.400	2.500	.100
18.	3.065	2.518	.547*	3.114	3.371	.257
19.	3.435	2.688	.747*	3.500	3.643	.143
20.	3.035	2.806	.229	3.071	3.243	.172
21.	2.518	2.212	.306	2.714	2.929	.215

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

TABLE 4. (continued)
Mean Degree of Centralization

	All Campus Officers Is	Preferred	Difference	All Central Officers Is	Preferred	Difference
22.	2.788	2.341	.447*	2.971	2.971	.000
23.	2.518	2.129	.389*	2.471	2.729	.258
24.	3.753	3.418	.335	4.057	4.314	.257

Table 5. shows the mean degree of centralization for all campuses except Missouri in columns one, two and three. Column one is the opinion of the campus respondents of the degree of centralization that now exists while column two is the preferred. Column three is the difference of the means.

For all campus respondents, except Missouri, only 1(Academic Extension), 2(Assessment of Services to the State) and 6(Athletics) was more centralization preferred than now exists. For all other items they preferred less centralization. Only 7(Budgetary Allocation), 14(New Academic Programs) and 19(Public Service Extension) are statistically significant and these are for less centralization.

Columns four, five and six are for Missouri campus respondents only and can be compared to other campus respondents reported in column one, two and three. It is clear that Missouri campus respondents (all four campuses combined) prefer more decentralization in every one of the twenty-four categories considered. Those that are statistically significant toward greater decentralization are 1(Academic Extension-credit), 3(Accounting), 7(Budgetary Allocations), 8(Budgetary Control), 9(Contract Administration), 19(Federal Government Relations), 11(Food Services), 13(Graduate School Administration), 14(New Academic Programs), 16(Nonacademic Personnel), 17(Physical Plant), 18(Planning),

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

19(Priority for New Buildings), 20(Public Service Extension), 21(Public Information), 22(Purchasing) and 23(Tenure and Promotion).

TABLE 5.

Mean Degree of Centralization
Campus Officers

	Total Except Missouri			Missouri Only		
	Is	Preferred	Difference	Is	Preferred	Difference
1.	2.134	2.151	-.017	2.431	1.961	.470*
2.	3.370	3.412	-.042	3.549	3.196	.353
3.	2.773	2.622	.151	3.902	2.510	1.392*
4.	1.773	1.773	.000	2.059	1.745	.314
5.	1.891	1.807	.084	1.784	1.647	.137
6.	1.782	1.857	-.075	1.647	1.667	.020
7.	3.176	2.748	.428*	3.922	2.706	1.216*
8.	2.731	2.462	.269	3.373	2.255	1.118*
9.	2.605	2.445	.160	3.784	2.471	1.313*
10.	2.933	2.748	.185	3.843	3.039	.804*
11.	1.882	1.832	.050	3.078	2.431	.647
12.	2.387	2.294	.093	2.412	2.000	.412
13.	2.387	2.218	.169	2.118	1.725	.393*
14.	2.689	2.294	.395*	3.804	2.353	1.451*
15.	2.185	2.092	.093	2.922	2.392	.530
16.	2.378	2.076	.302	3.353	2.333	1.020*
17.	2.252	2.067	.185	3.451	2.510	.941*
18.	2.739	2.487	.252	3.824	2.588	1.236*

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

TABLE 5. (continued)

Mean Degree of Centralization
Campus Officers

	Total Except Missouri			Missouri Only		
	Is	Preferred	Difference	Is	Preferred	Difference
19.	3.151	2.681	.470*	4.098	2.706	1.392*
20.	2.790	2.765	.025	3.608	2.902	.706*
21.	2.185	2.118	.067	3.294	2.431	.863*
22.	2.529	2.311	.218	3.392	2.412	.980*
23.	2.303	2.143	.160	3.020	2.098	.922*
24.	3.529	3.370	.159	4.275	3.529	.746

Table 6. shows the comparison of the mean degree of centralization by all campus respondents outside of Missouri to the opinions of the Missouri respondents. Data for the degree of centralization now believed to exist are reported in columns one, two and three. Columns four, five and six show the same group of comparisons but the basis of these are the preference opinions.

Missouri respondents believe that there is more centralization in the Missouri system than campus respondents in other states believe exists for their campuses except for items 5(Alumni Relations), 6(Athletics) and 13(Graduate School Administration). Of the items (5,6 and 13) for which centralization is believed less in Missouri than elsewhere, none of the differences are statistically significant. Missouri respondents felt more centralization exists in Missouri than did those from campuses for all other items; for seventeen items the differences are statistically significant and shown by the asterisk in the table.

In the preferred degree of centralization, Missouri respondents desired less centralization than respondents from other states in eleven categories and more in thirteen categories. However, only 11(Food Service) is statistically significant, desiring more centralization than other respondents, and only 13(Graduate School Administration) desiring less centralization is statistically significant.

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

In preference, the Missouri respondents are not significantly different from campus respondents from other systems. The Missouri opinion is very expressive that the local system is much more highly centralized than correspondents from outside of the state reported for the composite. Interviews with several Missouri representatives suggest that the opinion of greater centralization may result from communication deficiencies between the central academic affairs officer and the campuses. This probability should be clearly explored before concluding that the Missouri system is in reality more centralized than the average of other systems.

TABLE 6.

Campus Comparisons—Mean Degree of Centralization

	Is			Preferred		
	All Campuses except Mo.	Mo.	Diff.	All Campuses except Mo.	Mo.	Diff.
1.	2.134	2.431	-.297	2.151	1.961	.190
2.	3.370	3.549	-.179	3.412	3.196	.216
3.	2.773	3.902	-1.129*	2.622	2.510	.112
4.	1.773	2.059	-.286	1.773	1.745	.028
5.	1.891	1.784	.107	1.807	1.647	.160
6.	1.782	1.647	.135	1.857	1.667	.190
7.	3.176	3.922	-.746*	2.748	2.706	.042
8.	2.731	3.373	-1.142*	2.462	2.255	.207
9.	2.605	3.784	-1.179*	2.445	2.471	-.026
10.	2.933	3.843	-.910*	2.748	3.039	-.291
11.	1.882	3.078	-1.196*	1.832	2.431	-.599*
12.	2.387	2.412	-.025	2.294	2.00	.294
13.	2.387	2.118	.269	2.218	1.725	.493*
14.	2.689	3.804	-1.115*	2.294	2.353	-.059
15.	2.185	2.922	-.737*	2.092	2.392	-.300
16.	2.378	3.353	-.975*	2.076	2.333	-.257
17.	2.252	3.451	-1.199*	2.067	2.510	-.443
18.	2.739	3.824	-1.085*	2.487	2.588	-.101
19.	3.151	4.098	-.947*	2.681	2.706	-.025
20.	2.790	3.608	-.818*	2.765	2.902	-.137

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

TABLE 6. (continued)
Campus Comparison— Mean Degree of Centralization

	IS			Preferred		
	All Campuses except Mo.	Mo.	Diff.	All Campuses except Mo.	Mo.	Diff.
21.	2.185	3.294	-1.109*	2.118	2.431	-.313
22.	2.529	3.392	-.863*	2.311	2.412	-.101
23.	2.303	3.020	-.717*	2.134	2.098	.045
24.	3.529	4.275	-.746*	3.370	3.529	-.159

---

*Statistically significant at the 5 percent level

Section V: Theory Varified: The University System in Contemporary Higher Education— Results of Campus and Central Office Visits—

Chapter 13

ESTABLISHING STATEWIDE COORDINATION

Most academic disciplines can be considered in either a theoretical or an applied context and higher education governance is no exception. Unlike the academic economist who compromises his theories during a stint at the Treasury Department, however, the student of higher education governance enjoys a remarkable correlation between the theoretical and applied aspects of his field. The goals of diversity and specialization set forth by Lee and Bowen are indeed being tested at public universities across the country. A comparative analysis of these institutions resembles the solution to a jigsaw puzzle. Successful aspects of coordination in one state may have dismally unsuccessful counterparts in another state. When viewed as a whole, however, the pieces fit into a viable and highly useful framework. The most striking aspect of contemporary public higher education is the necessity for strong but flexible statewide coordination. The degree of such coordination varies widely from state to state but an aggregation of experiences underscores the benefits of a strong and flexible statewide agency. Such coordination may take several forms but its role is clearly paramount when higher education must cope with increasingly limited resources. Other pieces of the puzzle include identifying who should participate in the administration of the university system and how. Administrative aspects concern systemwide communication and a cautious delineation of duties between the central and campus offices is required. Finally, comparing systems yields significant differences in the nature of coordinated higher education over time. Few states have totally neglected the need for systematically organizing higher education. Many brilliant successes and many disappointing mistakes have characterized the evolution of these efforts. An understanding of the success as well as the mistakes is the basis for productive and useful comparison of academic structures.

Regulatory Agencies: The overworked analogies between business and education frequently raise more questions than answers. The comparison takes on some interesting forms, however, when applied to the coordination of higher education. In the late sixties when higher education enrollments were growing ten percent a year and facilities expanding rapidly to keep up with the demand, new "firms" were entering the "industry" and physical investment in higher education was immense. As enrollment growth rates approach three and four percent, or suffer absolute declines, the expansion in the number of institutions in recent years seems ill-advised indeed. Since higher education is a public service institution instead of a profit maximizing firm, it cannot simply leave the industry when demand for its products fall. This inherent rigidity is the basis of the drive to coordinate higher education to maximize social benefits while minimizing operating expenses.

Extending the analogy, public educational institutions may be considered competitors in the student market. Nonprice competition has joined the traditional battle of grants and scholarships in seeking to attract students as enrollment growth tapers off. The solution, as practiced by academia's managers, is a sort of educational cartel. Consisting of numerous autonomous units, a coordinated system reduces the competitive pressures and permits education to freely pursue specialization and diversity in the proper academic tradition. Without the sinister overtones of monopoly, education has attempted collusion in the public interest, seeking to provide a public service at a politically palatable price.

The need for this "educational cartel" is most o obvious in states where efforts to coordinate have been the least effective. In Texas, for example, only the University of Texas has centralized its operations. Several other institutions, including Texas Tech, Texas A&M* and the University of Houston in addition to two and four year institutions clamor for public support. As a result of the vigorous competition the University of Texas has not been able to exercise serious control over its own program expansion. Fearing that failure to move into a field will result in the vacuum being filled by a competitor's entry, the University of Texas probably exercised less restraint in proposing new programs than it might have otherwise. Such competition is proclaimed by critics in any state as educational imperialism which clearly negates the value of coordination even at the system level and exemplifies the need for a strong and flexible statewide coordinating agency. Dilemmas such as the University of Texas faces demonstrate a clear mandate for academic planning as well. Obviously, academic planning cannot be effective in states where deficient coordination creates vicious institutional competition, whether among independent institutions or between formal systems.

The problem of centralized coordination is clearly reflected in a comparison of polar extremes. Neither Kentucky nor Pennsylvania has tried to develop university systems typical of other states of their size. They both are situated on the periphery of their respective approaches to coordination. Pennsylvania has historically relied heavily on private institutions to carry the bulk of higher education. Consistent with national trends, however, the private sector's market share has declined as the quality of lower tuition public institutions improves. Relative to most states the influence of statewide coordination has not accompanied the growth in the public sector. The result is a system of higher education where uncoordinated campus missions appear to have resulted in program overlaps and probably some unproductive duplications.

---

*Texas A&M has satellite campuses but does not meet Lee and Bowen's definition of a multicampus system.

The bulk of public higher education is carried by Pennsylvania State University with twenty-two campuses, seventeen of which are two-year institutions. Supplementing this system are the Commonwealth Universities, Temple and the University of Pittsburgh, which receive sizable state subsidies for Pennsylvania residents who matriculate. The private institutions continue to be a major source of higher education for the state. This complex structure and the absence of a relatively strong statewide coordinating agency has rendered academic planning difficult and consequently permits the potential for duplication and unnecessary overlap.

Kentucky, on the other hand, is currently experimenting with a unique coordinating structure which emphasizes the importance of centralized statewide regulatory authority. The Kentucky Council on Higher Education is headed by an executive director with high level university experience whose salary is slightly higher than the President of the University of Kentucky. Unlike a conventional state commission on higher education, the Kentucky Council has direct recommending authority over mission and funding of all higher education in the state. Kentucky's higher education is largely public and consists of two research level institutions, the University of Kentucky located in Lexington and the formerly private University of Louisville. Six four-year institutions are also scattered around the state and offer limited masters degree programs. Each of these eight institutions has its own governing board. The University of Kentucky operates numerous two-year community colleges outside the commuting distance of the state colleges. This skewed three tier system with eight boards is coordinated by the Kentucky Council which constitutes the ultimate recommending authority in the state for resource allocation, programs and new campuses. With an evaluation authority in these areas similar to that of system boards in multicampus states, the Council is empowered to generate policy directives in crucial areas which if accepted by the legislature, are binding on the operations of the institutions. The institutional boards are charged with the execution of the central policy directives recommended by the Council and approved by the legislature.

In retaining the individual boards and existing campus administrative structures the Kentucky plan guarantees a great deal of autonomy to each institution. Unlike the Pennsylvania system, however, academic planning and program review can be expediently implemented within the integrated structure. The structures in both states are relatively recent and have not yet received wholehearted acclaim or denunciation. While the final analysis may not lend unqualified approval to either extreme, the direction in which Kentucky leans is likely to emerge as the more effective way of coordinating public higher education. Kentucky's plan may well prove to have too many institutional board members or fail to satisfy the taxpayers in the state. Whatever the outcome, however, the plan's realistic assessment of resource scarcity and the need for centralized allocation has important implications for educational policymakers. The future success of public higher education depends on the state's ability to exercise a strong but flexible system of coordinating higher education.

If the desirability of strong but flexible statewide coordination is accepted, a proposal to implement that policy is in order. Statewide coordination has historically assumed two forms. Most states have established a commission on higher education frequently staffed by civil servants and endowed with few regulatory functions. Some such agencies have assumed broad authority and exerted an important regulatory influence on higher education in the state.

In deciding which form of coordination should be adopted, states must consider variables unique to their context. Useful structures for coordinating higher education in California clearly derive from a different base than in neighboring Nevada. No universal decision rule can predict greater success using one form of coordination than another. In general, however, California's three tiered structure with an effective central advisory coordinating agency is a good model for states in which higher education involves a relatively great number of institutions. Since the number of institutions is a function of the state's population and the state's level of support for higher education, these two factors can be isolated as the determinants of a successful coordinating structure. Accordingly, states like Texas, Tennessee, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Louisiana and Ohio might be well advised to establish a university system, a state college system and perhaps a junior college system coordinated by a strong and flexible agency created by the state legislature.

Georgia and Florida are states with large populations which have historically functioned well under a consolidated board. Consolidation appears desirable for states of less than 2,000,000 people for four-year colleges and university centers. West Virginia, Nevada or South Dakota, appears to enjoy more advantages than disadvantages for consolidated states; the inclusion of junior colleges is debatable. However, a single board for large states with a wide variety of institutions, such as North Carolina and Wisconsin, presents complex administrative problems. These must be overcome to make a merged system superior to two or three separate systems of similar institutions.

North Carolina's 1971 consolidation has progressed smoothly, primarily because of the high caliber and vast experience of the people charged with implementing the change. Yet the legislature this spring voted for a new two year medical school that had not been recommended by the consolidated board that it so recently created. Future central staffs might not be as successful in holding together a diversified system. Many educators inside both the Wisconsin and North Carolina systems are not yet convinced that consolidation is best for their respective states.

Administrative Personnel: Once coordinated higher education is conceptualized and structured it must be staffed. A successful university system consists of at least two components, structure and personnel, and frequently the portion of success ascribable to each component is indiscernable. Experiences from Florida to Wisconsin and California to New York show that good people can make any structure work, but no structural brilliance can completely mitigate ineptness of personnel. Some feel that consolidation is successfully functioning in Florida and Georgia, not on its own merits, but because of the expertise of the system leaders. Similar success is predicted in North Carolina and Wisconsin for the same reasons.

Just who should govern modern educational conglomerates thus becomes an important question. The conventional image of the aloof and sometimes politically arrogant college president is as antiquated as required chapel or dormitory hours. Given the economic pressures, indeed crises, which characterize modern higher education, many sound arguments favor turning the system over to business trained managers, accustomed to minimizing costs and maximizing revenue. Education definitionally defies such a market solution, however, and no widespread use of such managers has surfaced. The successful compromise seems to be more an educator than a businessman, an academician with well tuned managerial sensitivity. The best central staff officers and executives, in fact, usually meet two criteria. They have a proven track record on the campus level firing line. The value of such experience is intuitively obvious; an effective central executive or staff must realize they manage a component organization and be able to empathize with the campus elements of the system. Secondly, the system executive must have an academic background. Since education can be fully appreciated only by the educated, a strictly business oriented manager most often would be a poor academic policymaker. Good academic governance thus depends not only on proper administrative structure and managerial acumen of central officers, but on campus level experiences of those officers, and their academic backgrounds as well.

Chapter 14

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

Internal Communication: A properly structured and staffed university system is a potentially powerful tool in education's struggle with increasingly limited resources of all types. Of the various administrative aspects of multicampus governance, communication is the most elementary and one of the most important for successful multicampus management. The most straightforward method of internal communications grows from the simple line authority between the system executive and his campus executives. Most system executives hold regularly scheduled conferences with their campus counterparts, frequently at one month intervals. These formally scheduled meetings do not preclude other frequent and lengthy communications between central and campus executive offices, however. Line authority clearly provides the most obvious and direct communication link between central systems and campuses, but offers little direct communications among campuses of the same system.

Systemwide communication is a problematic issue and rarely dealt with completely in a formal manner. Ad hoc committees and task forces drawn from campus elements and central staff constitute the majority of intercampus communication. Several states have established standing administrative committees and councils which attempt to bridge this gap. In California, for example, the predictable Conference of Vice-Presidents and Council of Chancellors are important communication links. Also important for evaluation of academic programs is the Council of Vice-Chancellors. This third council of second level campus officers interacts with the system President and exercises advisory influence over academic matters. The three groups interacting directly with the President have been judged highly effective by observers.

A similar pattern holds for the University of Maryland system where several advisory committees drawn from the campuses interact directly with the system President. In addition to the Administrative Council consisting of chancellors and vice-presidents, an Advisory Committee for Graduate Studies and Research interacts not only with the Vice-President for Graduate Studies and Research, but with the President as well. This committee consists of campus graduate deans and members of the faculties. A budget council also advises the President of the Maryland system; its membership is drawn from key administrators at both the campus and system level.

At the University of Illinois, the President's executive cabinet is somewhat more limited. Participation is restricted to the three chancellors, the Vice-President for Planning and Resource Allocation and the Vice-President for Academic Development. By virtue of its compactness this group is quite influential and the chancellors are pleased to have a strong voice in universitywide policy. The President of the University of Illinois is advised by each of the three faculty senates through the senates' conference with six members from each of the three campus senates. Systemwide faculty committees seem to function most effectively in Georgia where they have operated for many years. Such committees in the Georgia system are responsible for position papers and policy recommendations. One of the vice-chancellors meets with these groups to give them the backing of the chancellor's office.

In Illinois, North Carolina and New York, the main impetus for systemwide communications appears to come from the newer campuses which are frequently smaller and not so mature as other components of the system.

Only in a few states have systemwide faculty councils been established. Usually greeted with grudging lethargy by the flagship campus, such councils are invariably advisory and sometimes weak since they lack the hearty support of all elements of the system. North Carolina, California and New York are three of the few states where systemwide faculty senates or councils operate and the success rating varies with respondents. Louisiana, Missouri and Wisconsin have not established systemwide faculty councils, but prefer to communicate in less formal ways.

Far more effective than systemwide faculty councils with blanket advisory range are specific committees charged with academic planning or program review. In North Carolina, for example, a systemwide twenty member council drawn from campus faculties and deans acts as watchdog over graduate programs. Although North Carolina has only three doctoral level public institutions, the systemwide council appears to be a useful safeguard for quality control. In Kentucky and Missouri much of the academic planning is carried out by task forces and ad hoc committees consisting of educators and lay citizens. Program review in California is accomplished by a board consisting of four central staff members, four faculty members nominated by the systemwide faculty senate and students.

Although the Steering Committee of the Program Review Board consists only of the four members from the central office, it has nevertheless functioned as an effective communications link between each campus and the system. Communication, clearly so basic to the success of a multicampus or consolidated university system, seems best carried out through the functioning of specific committees and task forces supplementing formal central staff meetings and cabinet meetings of the central officers and campus executives.

Central and Campus Functions, A Summary: One of the most perplexing issues surrounding the success of a multi-campus university is where decisions are made. In the broadest sense, every system claims that policy directives are issued from central offices and interpreted and carried out at the campus level. California again serves as the classic model in illustrating how this procedure should work. The California chancellors are charged with operationalizing the policies of the Board of Regents and executive directives of the President, sometimes exercising this authority with considerable variation. While such flexible autonomy is important to the success of even as homogenous a unit as the University of California system, problems can develop. The degree of decentralization in California has reached such a point that the same system directives may be interpreted quite differently on each campus. Insofar as these differences account for factors unique to the individual campus, the system is operating as intended. Other intervening variables may come into play, however, including the personalities of the campus officers involved. Flexibility in campus administrative structures is a desirable characteristic of any system as campuses are different. California seems to be seeking ways to tighten up the decision making process without involving central officers in line administration at the campus level. The one exception is agriculture and closely related research units, which are the responsibility of the central administration.

Recent tenure problems at Wisconsin reflect in a succinct example the extent to which these consistency problems may develop*. The problem in Wisconsin is greatly exacerbated by the immense diversity of the consolidated system of higher education. Based on the generally understood shared concept of duties, any central office would set criteria for tenure qualifications, but leave the actual implementation and hence specific decisions up to the campus officers.

---

*The current problem has resulted from the traditionally different tenure standards of the recently merged systems and is not felt to be based on present system policy.

Shouldn't there be, faculty critics ask, a systemwide appeals mechanism so unhappy faculty members could carry their cases directly to the people who set the guidelines and not simply to the campus operatives who attempted to implement those policies? Such proposals represent challenges of authority between the campus and central administrations. The responsibility is upon central officers to establish criteria for issues in such broad terms that variations in implementation are not likely to be challenged. More generally, in dividing campus and central functions, the body charged with specific implementation should be prepared to defend its decisions and have had previous input in establishing policy. The fundamental feeling that policy decisions should be centralized and operational functions should be on the campuses is a prevailing and generally workable proposition, but gray areas cause friction.

The federal constitution reserves all powers to the states with the exception of items mentioned specifically in that revered document. This precedent is a useful framework for considering the responsibilities of campus and central administrations in multicampus governance. Indeed, the modern multicampus university is a federation of sorts and the old issues of states' rights figure prominently in its administration. Like the federal government, central administrators should define their role and authority and delegate remaining authority to the campuses. From the experiences of major multicampus universities, what are the areas in which central administration has successfully played a major role? Most mature systems approach optimality when central officers are primarily concerned with resource allocation, legal and political matters, governmental contacts with political overtones and quality standards. Resource allocation is admittedly an extensive field, but one well suited to the vast planning capabilities of a large multicampus university. Closely related to this is the budgeting procedure which can be effectively conducted at the system level assuming the state grants lump sum appropriations. States as large as Illinois and Texas continue to debate appropriation control although the merits of lump sum grants have been proven. Experiences in Wisconsin and Maryland confirm that legislative liaison works well as a central function, if conducted in a low key manner, and approriate explanations are made at the propitious time.

Academic Planning in Action: One of the richest fields for central administration is in academic planning. Reasonable adequacy of resources has been legendary in California. Academic planning, campus mission and related matters are now assuming even more importance as public scrutiny and funding tighten. The University of Illinois provides a useful model for systemwide long-term academic planning. A vice-president for academic development oversees the internal quality aspects of planning operations which include campus representatives as well as other system officers. This vice-president meets regularly with campus vice-chancellors charged with academic affairs on their respective campuses. A universitywide planning committee consisting of the Vice-President for Academic Development, the Vice-President for Planning and Resource Allocation and two representatives from each campus is the definitive planning body in the University of Illinois system. In assembling the academic officers and representatives from the campuses, the planning committee insures fairness and moderation in its recommendations, which are ultimately among the most important any institution makes. External needs are considered along with internal ambitions.

The success of good planning is always evident in the few places it has received a serious test. In Arkansas, for example, external political factors may have postponed the full development of the University of Arkansas system. In the meantime, academic planners have enjoyed ample opportunities to define campus missions and coordinate the potential programs among the system's campuses. As a result of these efforts, not every campus is expected to duplicate the comprehensiveness of Fayetteville and future "misunderstandings" will likely be minimized. A dissimilar but equally significant development in Indiana likewise illustrates the success of careful planning. Under several informal agreements, Indiana University and Purdue have cooperated in setting up a series of regional campuses with clearly defined missions. Initially, the arrangement worked smoothly and the legislature kept its distance, happy to let the institutions perform their own planning. Although recent financial strains have prompted the legislature to move toward formal statewide planning, the precedent established by Indiana University and Purdue is commendable and effectively served the state in the past.

A final aspect of central authority, and an important component of academic planning, is the notion of campus mission. A workable understanding of the role each campus is to play in the multicampus university is at the very heart of such an organization. One of the most vigorous and consequently successful approaches to campus mission has been carried out by the University of Wisconsin. Wisconsin has grouped its programs and campuses along a cluster concept, limiting doctoral programs to Madison and Milwaukee. Other "clusters" include the specialized campuses at Stout and Green Bay, the cluster of two-year institutions which are headed by a single officer, and a cluster of other similar members of the system. The very existence and support of the highly innovative Green Bay campus suggests that the conceptual goals of diversity, specialization and cooperation can indeed be achieved. In Georgia as well as Arkansas, campus mission is carefully articulated and strongly supported. Illinois has devoted increasing attention to the role each of its campuses should play in the university system, especially at the doctoral and professional levels. The goals of multicampus organization are most clearly embodied in an understanding of campus mission and the importance of responsible planning is obviously paramount here.

An understanding of precisely what the role of the central office entails renders the question of campus responsibilities practically moot. Like the power reserved for the states by the federal constitution, the campuses are delegated any authority not exercised by the system. As the preceding discussion suggests, the system can most effectively allocate resources on a large scale basis and handle the thousands of political considerations faced by any public university. In general, the central office will consequently act as the policy headquarters, permitting campus executives to operationalize their directives as they interpret them for their campuses. In this way flexibility is maximized and the goals of multicampus organization can still be obtained.

Ultimate Role of the Governing Board: Whatever the delineation of duties between campus and central elements, few educators deny the governing board's extensive, if not absolute, authority in policy matters not controlled by the state. The value of a strong board was recently underscored in North Carolina when the normally powerful consolidated Board of Governors of the merged system fell under political pressure. Playing on its extensive political support and regional sympathies, Eastern Carolina University successfully appealed the Board's veto of a proposed medical school at Eastern Carolina University. The Board's decision was carried to the state legislature where a delicate matter of educational coordination was battled for weeks in the pages of the Raleigh papers, the legislative back rooms and finally in the legislative committees themselves. Ostensibly the decision was a compromise, an agreement to establish a one or two-year medical training center. Without the resistance of the board a complete medical school may have been legislated. In reality without a strong board this action could pave the way for a full fledged medical school at Eastern Carolina University and be more postponement than compromise. No goals of multicampus or consolidated organization are served when this sort of political intervention occurs. The single state governing board is the ultimate policy body to control resources of the state and programs insofar as education is concerned, but two or three tiered systems of multicampuses cooperating with a flexible advisory coordinating agency seems best qualified to balance resources and needs, and permit academic flexibility.

The Multicampus University; Short Run Problems, Long Run Success: A final note on a very special problem of multicampus organization is in order here. No institution of higher education has precipitated from the heavens overnight, emerging instantaneously as a full fledged multicampus university. Indeed most multicampus organizations are grafted from what Lee and Bowen have called the flagship campus, frequently the state's land grant institution and invariably the largest and oldest campus in the state.

The State University of New York is an exception. More often than not, additional campuses are created elsewhere from the foundations up, with the relatively rare exceptions of Missouri's Kansas City campus, Kentucky's Louisville* campus and the like. The commitment to multicampus status frequently leaves the flagship campus with somewhat of an educational identity crisis and a sense of threat from developing institutions under the same governing board. The perception might be characterized as zero sum mentality on the part of the flagship campuses in asserting that anyone else's gain is necessarily their loss. This sentiment is most evident at especially new systems or even older campuses where planning has not assigned missions to the campuses. This fear has long prevailed in many multicampus states. Given the resource crunch of recent years, however, such fears may not be as irrational as they seemed throughout the affluent sixties. Given the commitment to new campuses coupled with evaporating public support, Wisconsin faces an uphill battle in continuing to enhance the quality of its efforts at Madison and Milwaukee. It would be a loss to higher education in America if Chapel Hill or Madison were downgraded so that all members of the large systems could achieve some average level.

To be sure, the zero sum mentality is far from universal. California chancellors frequently promote the university system with the legislators and the general public, reasoning, quite correctly, that what's good for the system is good for their campus as well. Champaign-Urbana welcomed the addition of the Chicago Circle campus with an urban mission as a progressive step for higher education in urbanized areas. While petty jealousies and sometimes even personalities can disrupt the orderly transformation into a multicampus structure, California and Illinois illustrate that such does not have to be the case.

---

*Louisville is not a part of a multicampus system, but it receives sizeable grants from the state like the commonwealth universities of Pennsylvania.

An historical perspective largely eliminates any problems conceptualized by players of the zero sum game for higher education. In Louisiana, a central officer charged with institutional research for academic planning has accomplished a great deal towards relieving the perceived anxieties of multicampus structure. This was accomplished in a state where jealousies and fears were quite prevalent. As a system, the University of Tennessee is just now achieving the identity required to function effectively. The new campuses of the system had a predefined mission and this has eliminated many planes for possible friction. Georgia, the first state to adopt what has become known as a consolidated structure, illustrates just how smoothly consolidated higher education can function. Campus mission is so well understood in Georgia after forty years that centralized directions are expected and planning is self initiated by the campuses. Although the long-term success of coordinated higher education remains to be seen for many states, the Illinois, Florida, Georgia, and California experience should allay the fears of doomsday prophets from the flagship campuses. From any standpoint the ultimate success of coordinated higher education along the multicampus or consolidated models can hardly be challenged when compared to a group of competing independent institutions.

Section VI: Integration of Literature Reports, Statistical Analysis and Visits to Central Offices and Campuses

SECTION INTRODUCTION

The three components which constitute this study have been presented with minimum subjectivity beyond their intrinsic bias. Literature, interviews and even empirical work are all subject to the perceptions of their authors.

Section VI is this writer's best judgment of several important issues facing boards, central offices and campus offices of the administration of consolidated or multicampus university systems. The position stated on each issue is based on agreement of at least two of the three following criteria used for judgment throughout this study: (a) publications of acknowledged leaders in the field, (b) the writer's observations of eighteen systems in seventeen states and about two hundred and fifty interviews with persons ranging from board members to students with the majority being campus or system administrators, (c) interpretation of the statistical study. Only issues having a high degree of support from at least two of these three measures are included. This section for most studies would have been designated "Recommendations". To many readers it may be accepted as such, but because of historical and statutory differences among states and university systems "reinforced suggestions" appear to describe more precisely the points presented.

Chapter 15

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1. In many states certain classifications of personnel are legally under the state civil service commission regardless of where they work. Academic personnel are not covered by the state civil service commission in any of the systems visited but in some, middle to upper level administrators are included (e.g. business and personnel officers). The university can work to alter these requirements, but cannot avoid compliance. The central administration of each system should apprise management and affected employees at all ranks of these requirements. The university's expertise in writing job descriptions is essential for efficient operation under these restraints. Writing these has to be shared between the central administration and the campuses.

2. Many states require that almost all purchases be made through state contracts. Neither the system nor the campus has much authority relating to purchases except that of writing specifications. The central administration should make university administrators at all levels and the faculty fully aware of these requirements. The university's ability to write precise specifications and follow up on orders is most important. The campus would seem to be the best source for specifications and the central administration is in the best position to expedite purchases.

3. Many states delegate all authority for university capital construction and improvements to the state building commission. Such requirements make the university more competitive with other state agencies than arrangements permitting the university system to deal directly

with the governor and the legislature for its capital needs. The campuses are likely to have less influence in determining building specifications when civil servants instead of educators control the funds. The system has to maintain effective liaison with the state building commission and the campuses must be expert in writing specifications to meet their needs.

4. Most states have some degree of line item appropriations which vary from very few to detailed position lines. A line appropriation to a campus frees the university system from unpopular decisions of allocating to each campus from an appropriated pool. It also invites political logrolling in determining the amount for each campus and weakens the system. A lump sum appropriation should be made charging the system with the authority, responsibility and accountability for allocations to campuses.

5. Many states require the audit of university expenditures by the state. This requirement molds the accounting system of the university to the state's format which may not be suited to the university's needs. While a state audit is clearly the least expensive option open to the university, the loss of flexibility renders an independent audit more desirable.

6. Some states require that all university generated income be paid to the state and then become a part of the total appropriation to the university. The university has more flexibility if it has the right to retain and disburse all of its self-generated income.

7. In many states over the years, the legislatures have given universities programs they did not specifically request. To alleviate this problem, good program

planning by the university system and its campuses is urged. The necessary planning will require a better assessment of needs in the state than has been the practice of most universities.

8. The governing boards in some states are obligated to be represented by the office of the state attorney general. In such cases the university should appoint an attorney to serve as secretary or counsel of the university and simultaneously hold a secondary title in the attorney general's office.

9. In a few states, open meeting laws make executive sessions of the governing board for personnel matters open. In these cases the university is best served by delegating to the system executive broad authority over personnel matters.

10. In a few states the governor has sole authority to appoint all members of the university's governing board. It is beneficial to the university to have some sharing in the selection power for board members.

Chapter 16

STATE COORDINATING AGENCIES

1. Every state needs strong but flexible coordination of higher education. A university system is weakened in its capabilities as a coordinator if the state agency is so ineffective that competing institutions are permitted to infringe on the proper mission of the university system. The system also suffers setbacks if the state coordinating agency is so inflexible that it prohibits the university from defining and implementing its proper mission.

2. State coordinating commissions have varying degrees of power. Program approval and addition or deletion of campuses within the state, including the university systems, seems appropriate to the commission's realm. Any form of control of the internal functioning of the university system by the coordinating commission is detrimental. The multicampus university is fully capable of managing its internal affairs including budget determinations. In states with independent institutions, such as Kentucky, it seems appropriate that the coordinating commission be responsible for budgetary recommendations for all institutions.

3. The state coordinating agency should be a buffer between the academic nature of the university and the political forces of the state. The coordinating agency for higher education should be a strong advocate of higher education to meet the needs of the state with quality programs.

4. Except for certain historical cases, the educational needs of a state with a large or larger than average population are better served by multicampus systems of like

institutions, coordinated by a strong but flexible agency, rather than a single governing and coordinating board.

5. Previous high level academic and administrative university experience would be beneficial to the executive and the senior level staff of state coordinating agencies. The board members of the coordinating agency should be leaders from a wide cross section of state interests and be free of political or educational ties.

6. The state coordinating agency must be an advocate for quality higher education to the extent necessary to meet the needs of the state. This stance is rightfully expected of the agency by both the public and educational institutions even if it proves to be a politically unpopular one. Different interests will debate the level of adequacy, but an agency striving for economy alone without due regard for quality and need is fulfilling only half of the responsibilities for which it is charged.

Chapter 17

MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS

In this chapter important issues discussed in previous sections are presented specifically. The reader is encouraged to review the criteria for the chapter as stated in the section introduction on page 215. The focus from the three criteria listed there seems to document the validity of the points included. Structures and functions cannot be divorced from local conditions, but the basic considerations of this section seem generally applicable and only minor deviations will be necessary to account for variations among states.

1. Nothing is as important in the structure of a multicampus system as the governing board. Members should be selected on a broader basis than gubernatorial appointment only, include a broad cross section of the state's interests and be free of political ties. Alleged campus favoritism can be avoided if enough board members are graduates of institutions outside the state or are distinguished leaders who may not have college degrees.

2. The system executive is the interface between the board and the system and the board should focus on his leadership and accountability. Except for open board meetings which all citizens may attend by law, attendance at other board assemblies by staff should be by invitation of the system executive.

3. The system executive should try to attend all committee meetings of the board rather than delegate this on a regular basis to his staff. With heavy demands on boards, and specific legal concerns in most states, boards which function through committees are the most effective.

4. Board members should know the principal officers of all campuses and visit the campuses to observe strengths and needs firsthand. These visits often can be combined with ceremonial functions but an intermingling of social and official business activities is discouraged.

5. If permitted by state law, the system executive should be the only officer reporting to the board. The executive, his personal staff and his front line officers can serve the staff needs of the board at the highest possible level. The board may want to retain a legal firm to evaluate recommendations from the system executive that may have serious legal implications.

6. The board should be responsible for establishing policy and goals and directing the system executive to implement and achieve these. Implementation and administrative duties should be performed on a shared basis between the central and campus staffs.

7. The size of the executive system staff reporting to the head varies greatly. In systems studied for this report, such staffs ranged from two to fourteen officers. The system executive's personal staff needs are determined by his style of operation and no attempt is made to evaluate these needs. The nature of multicampus governance suggests that the system executive must be supported by the following executive officers: (a) Administration, (b) Business and Finance, (c) Academic Affairs, (d) Program Planning,

(e) University Counsel and (f) University Relations. Each of these officers may be given auxillary duties to fill the gaps perceived by the system executive. In large systems more officers may be required but high quality is more important to the executive and board than quantity.

8. The campus executives must report directly to the system executive, but should understand the responsibility of the system executive's front line staff. Campus executives and central staff should function as peers in the solution of the mutual problems of the campuses and central office. If an executive or deputy to the system executive is needed, as may be the case for systems with a large number of campuses, he should not cut the line responsibility between the system executive and campus executive.

9. The system executive should establish multi-lines of communications but all participants must understand the lines of authority for decision making. The system executive is encouraged to have regular formal meetings for two way communications with the following groups: (a) his front line central staff, (b) the campus executives without central staff*, (c) a combination of central staff and campus staff as a cabinet, but with less frequent meetings than separate groups, (d) representative faculty groups, (e) representative student groups and (f) an alumni federation. (This organization aids in the enhancement of the public image of the university and can help defend the budget request.)

As a result of these meetings the system executive will be able to place issues in the proper position for action and decision and report at the next meeting of each respective group on the progress or completion of action. Occassionally another person may have to chair these groups but the executive's personal participation should be regular enough to enable participants to recognize them as "summit" meetings.

---

*Addition of the central academic affairs officer may be desirable.

10. The campus executives should pattern similar meetings locally so that information exchanged at the system executive's group meetings can be fully disseminated on the campuses. Obviously some sensitive matters will be discussed with the executive cabinet (9) and these should not be prematurely introduced into other groups.

11. The central staff should be as small as possible below the front line officers reporting to the executive. Highly qualified assistants to some of these officers are necessary. For example, the business-finance officer must have adequate support from a good finance person and another in facilities management. These are second level central staff and are essential; not all officers, however, are expected to need second level staff assistants. Overstaffing below the second level frequently usurps campus jurisdiction. From the published reports and interviews the first and sometimes the second level staff of the system often seem insufficient in number and even sometimes in quality to function as desired by the executive and the board. Salary related costs are increased more by a wide based administrative pyramid than by the few persons near the top.

12. The central system has to serve as a coordinator of programs, the approving authority for budget requests and the allocator of resources. To accomplish this the central staff must have good information from the campuses, clearly understand board policies, know the needs of the state, understand the political climate of the state and have good institutional data including the specific strengths and weaknesses of each campus.

13. The system executive has to be the principal architect in designing proper liaison with the governor and the legislature. When his plan is designed and ready for implementing he should select people from the board, the central staff and the campuses to help him in specific areas. The system executive and the president of the board should be the contacts with the governor. The university relations officer should be a primary assistant to the system executive for legislative liaison and enlist alumni and friends to augment endeavors of university officials in advancing the university causes with different audiences, including the legislature. Other officers obtain information from the campuses and from noneducation interests within the state. Each central staff officer should be given liaison responsibilities for the state agency most closely related to his primary duties.

14. The best method for internal allocations of funds to the campus for instruction and departmental research is by a formula based on student credit hours weighted for program categories and level. Administrative and faculty task forces from the system will debate the percent of total resources that should go to instruction and departmental research and the formula weight by category and level for student credit hours taught. These debates will improve internal communications and dispel the magic which faculty members often think is used in resource allocation. The use of enrichment components is desirable for categories within the primary mission of a campus as this will encourage the campus to build quality in these missions.

15. Obviously not all funds should be allocated by formula but many other budgetary items can be related to the instruction and departmental research needs. These can be established as increments to the instruction and departmental research allocations; the library budget is an example. Many physical plant needs can be related to the square feet of building space to be served. About 75 to 80 percent of the operating budget can be allocated by formula to achieve both equity and understanding. The remainder would be allocated for needs not defined by formula and for special thrusts for which the campus heads will negotiate with the system executive.

Formula budgeting discourages classes with fewer than ten students, course duplication, program replication, and new program proposals which will not attract many students. It also enhances internal communication.

In many states the coordinating commission develops formulas and makes direct recommendations to the governor and legislature for each campus of the state, including each campus of the system. This type of operation usually results in line appropriations for each campus, and since all needs for a research level campus are not fully adaptable to a formula, supplements are difficult to sell to the legislature. An internal allocation formula by the university system, if a good one, will likely be borrowed by the coordinating council if the council is empowered by the legislature to make direct budgetary recommendations. Special items to be exempt from formulas should be carefully delineated by the university and fully justified.

16. If campuses are allocated funds by an internal formula, the campus executive usually has the freedom to deviate somewhat in the use of funds. This flexibility encourages efficiency and gives the campuses some elbow room for self-expression and innovation.

17. The weighted student credit hour allocation by category and level permits a determination of the number of faculty needed for departmental instruction and research. Further faculty full-time equivalent (FTE) needs will be set by allocations for organized research and extension.

No specific criteria are expressed on the proper ratio of nonacademic to academic personnel. Better uses of resources suggests that a reduction in nonacademic personnel with better supervision and more adequate tools should have a high priority in cost saving efforts and sustaining academic quality. The determination of the need for nonacademic personnel at both the campus and central levels must be carefully studied. Many have noted that administrative control on adding nonacademic personnel is weak in most systems and campuses.

18. The total cost for administration for the central office plus the campuses should be less than management of independent campuses. If a system does not have data to prove that this saving exists it has missed one of the potential arguments for the system's existence. Most systems, unfortunately, do not yet have adequate data to answer this question.

19. A university system of similar level institutions should list in its degree program inventory the distinct programs on all campuses and not repeat duplicating programs. If duplicating programs do not increase the cost per student credit hour taught, this is not replication of programs and should be of no concern to critics. If programs are duplicated for sound academic reasons or for local service, at a higher unit cost than if combined on one campus, the following should be carefully explored: (a) assess the value to the state of offering the program

at more than one location, (b) assess the academic value of the interaction of expensive programs with other programs on the campus if these expensive programs are stronger on another campus, (c) explore the loss if one, two or all duplicating programs were dropped and (d) attempt to share programs with another campus to reduce the unit cost to what it would be if offered on one campus only; shared programs are strongly urged.

20. With the lower national college enrollment forecast, the nation appears to have more and larger campuses than needed by the conventional concepts of the nature and mode of higher education. The drop in enrollment in some urban campuses in the fall of 1973 while residential campuses in the same systems grew or held their own, may be the beginning of a slow trend away from commuter campuses. Residential campuses appear to offer advantages for graduate work in the natural sciences and engineering and for many first degree professional programs. Urban campuses have strong natural advantages in many programs, but not all urban campuses have given these unique opportunities a high priority for development.

Because of the zero growth expected nationally in college enrollments and the attractiveness of a particular type campus for specific programs, much more attention will have to be given to program planning in the future if the multicampus university is to maintain an enrollment balance and thereby achieve the coordinating function expected of it.

21. More emphasis on planning will also be necessary to utilize scarce resources efficiently. Some programs of academic value, but of low value or interest to the state, may have to be dropped to gain resources to introduce new programs of greater interest to the state. If this is not accomplished, legislative resistance to the

university's budget requests is likely to increase. Also those of poor academic quality and low productivity may advantageously be replaced by new ones of greater vitality.

22. Administration is performed best at the campus level unless it can be established clearly that costs will be lower if centralized. This will not diminish the effectiveness of the central administration as a coordinator and overseer of board policy. If the system executive assigns specific duties to his first level staff and provides them able second line assistants when needed, good management is expected.

23. Shared programs in high cost areas are encouraged and seem natural for a multicampus system. The potential for these is accepted, but few have been made to work because of attitudes against change.

The administrative structure described in item seven of this section is believed adequate to produce positive results. Some respondents would accept a shared program if the student's diploma were signed by officers of his major professor's campus, but would be opposed to the shared program if signed by officers of another campus or only by central officers.

24. The management of health science centers and agriculture programs in multicampus systems varies greatly. In some systems a freestanding health science center will be headed by a chancellor or a president, reporting to the system executive, while one located within a comprehensive university in the same system will be headed by a vice-chancellor or a vice-president responsible to the campus head.

In other cases a health science center or an agricultural center located on a large campus is headed by respective officers reporting to the system executive rather than the campus executive. The campus executive has little if any responsibility for these units on his campus yet his campus services them in nonacademic areas.

It is clear that a different title for the same level of responsibility presents problems. It is also clear that the health science and agricultural leaders have presented strong arguments for being represented at a high level in the central administration of many systems rather than at the campus level where their activities occur. The wisdom of these structural deviations should be carefully studied in each system.

25. The health sciences are expensive and the feeling is general that the central system should allocate resources for an on campus health science center independent of other campus needs to avoid serious financial competition with other units of the campus. Respondents from both health science and nonrelated fields feel that the teaching hospital should be financed by other than university money or, if included in the university budget, it should be nearly self-supporting.

26. Each cabinet officer should review annually his goals with the system executive. If the executive does not fully agree with these plans he should initiate discussion with the people involved and each officer should soon present a revised plan satisfactory to the executive. This lets the officers know what the system head expects of each and an evaluation at the year's end is thus more fruitful.

27. The main thrust of the campus mission has to be defined by the central administration. With shared responsibility between the central office and its units, the campus executive has to be given some latitude in the details of programs within his mission. He knows the strengths and weaknesses of his campus better than anyone else and should know the priorities that can best permit the campus to build on its existing or historical strengths. If the internal alloca-

tion of resources is made by formula and negotiated supplements, the main thrust of each campus would evolve, and the focus would be sharpened through resource allocations.

Planning is a continuing process and it is the responsibility of the central officers to provide guidelines for the campus leaders to develop programs on each campus that will fulfill its mission in the system.

28. Each central executive staff officer, after consulting with the campus executive, should recommend to the system executive the councils, committees and task forces needed in his administrative area to help achieve the proper balance of shared responsibility.

29. The duties of the six basic administrative officers described in Chapter 6, are realistic. A few systems would increase the number but some others have fewer. Many systems tend to overload the academic affairs officer thus distracting his attention from guidance to the campus for faculty development, academic quality and program effectiveness. More important competing duties have caused the neglect of the most important role of interrelating the faculty-student family on each campus with the central administration.

30. The mechanics of building the budget has to be a business and finance function, but many systems have moved the responsibility for budgetary decisions away from the business and finance officer. It appears that the best compromise for budgetary recommendations to the system executive is a committee representing (a) business and finance, (b) academic affairs and (c) program planning. Since the physical plant and many items

of general institutional service fall under the general function of business and finance, it seems unwise for this area to be divorced from primary budgetary recommendations to the system executive.

31. Most systems consider research and continuing education as academic responsibilities of the campuses along with resident instruction. Accordingly, these should be related to central administration through the system's academic affairs officer. As noted earlier, there is a wide variation in the structuring of these two areas with some having virtually no central coordination in contrast to others with separate units for extension. A few systems have separate extension units structured independently of the campuses. They are often viewed by faculties and deans on the campuses as competitors which discourages efforts these people may otherwise put forth for extension.

Most systems delegate primary responsibility for extension to the campuses. Favorable reactions surround the ideas and suggestions emanating from the continuing education office of the central administration of the University of Tennessee as important aids in helping the campuses develop stronger extension activities.

32. The system executive with the help of the central staff is the interface between the board's responsibility for policy and the campuses' responsibility for operations. Care should be taken to avoid any duplication of operations between the campus and central level. Information basic to the board in its decision making role should be obtained centrally and guidelines established by staff for the campuses. This assures that their operations will be executed properly to implement board policies and executive directives and ultimately achieve the board's goals.

The system head's executive staff should be aware of their responsibility in evaluating campus situations for his consideration and hence making recommendations to the board to enable the campuses to operate more effectively and fulfill their missions. For example, the program planning officer must know thoroughly the needs of the state just as the academic affairs officer must know the academic strengths and weaknesses of each unit.

33. Almost without exception outside research proposals are delegated to the campuses and only large proposals that would commit significant university funds are reviewed at the universitywide level.

34. The system executive or his delegated central officer should have Washington contacts to keep abreast of federal funding and policies changes that could have an impact on the plans of the university. Promotion of project support is best managed by the campuses. The exceptions are large proposals which involve the expertise of more than one campus and for these the central office should be a catalyst.

35. A university system of research level institutions should do everything possible to keep doctoral level programs of the state within the system. This could mean resource priorities favoring programs that distinguish the university system from college systems or independent public institutions. Each campus in the research level class, however, must serve in a general way the needs of its region. Some have been aloof to less glamorous needs of their regions and this has been detrimental. Campuses must specialize at the professional and advanced graduate levels and no campus of the system should expect to be comprehensive in professional and advanced programs; Madison is an obvious exception.

36. Campus space utilization by departments and research units demands careful analyses to insure that the primary mission programs receive priority. Space deficiency solutions are usually pursued in this order: (a) relocation on campus, (b) renovation of space on campus, (c) establishing priority for new space.

37. Operational costs consist of fixed and variable components in universities as in business. With a given campus capacity, enrollment should be adjusted to the point that fixed cost is minimized as a percent of total cost. The University of California has a central admissions office and both academic quality and cost factors are considered when attempting to balance enrollments among campuses.

38. The central staff should not be located on any one of the campuses. This tends to make the campus feel it has uninvited house guests and concerns other campuses that the proximity of central offices to one campus is beneficial to that campus in decisions of the central office. Many respondents favored location of the system's office in the capital city as an advantage in achieving low profile relations with state officials and legislators. Some systems officers prefer proximity to a campus in order to observe fisthand the attitudes of students and faculty. These arguments seem equally persuasive.

39. Most systems minimize any direct involvement in operational matters by central officers. North Carolina operates a television network from the central office and some systems have an executive in agriculture or health sciences with line responsibility to one or more campuses and staff

responsibility to the system executive. The trend is for systems to delegate operational activities to the campuses and require campuses with special facilities to open their doors to other campuses for use of these.

40. Communications between the system executive and the faculties and students are important and the central academic affairs officer is usually charged with this responsibility. Some executives meet with representatives from these groups to explain recent actions of the board and administration and to invite suggestions of issues each group would like referred to the decision making line. The executive will present a progress report on these at the next meeting. Rapport is undoubtedly improved by this type of relationship even if meetings are only a few times a year.

41. Planning time probably should receive top priority in all administrators schedules. An annual two or three day seminar in a cloistered location for campus and system officers to discuss goals and guidelines has proven invaluable for many systems. Often selected students, faculty and citizens are invited to participate toward the end of the sessions. Planning is never complete but through annual refinements progress will be expedited toward major goals, such as making campus missions clear to all concerned.

42. The multicampus system is an excellent organization to achieve coordination which external forces expect today while simultaneously protecting the quality of higher education. The multicampus system needs the

help of a good state coordinating agency which is an advocate of quality higher education to meet the state's needs.

43. A multicampus or a consolidated system must build and sustain the quality of its strongest units even if clusters within the system have to be established. Several institutions of average quality cannot compensate for fewer ones of top quality.

44. The university is either the state's pride or scapegoat. Whatever their numbers, the critics always have a louder voice than friends. Meeting the real needs of the state by anticipating them and planning accordingly is the best defense. The system executive and all other administrators are responsible for helping the university relations officer maintain a favorable image for the university.

45. A multicampus system of like or similar institutions has advantages over one of widely different institutions. In homogeneous systems each campus should have a program scope adequate for high level work, but each should be limited to avoid replication. Shared programs are highly desirable for institutions of this type. To have a strong system the board must be a buffer between external critics and the central staff. The system executive and his executive staff must communicate board policies and goals to the campuses and share the administrative work load with them.

46. A university system with both residential and urban institutions has a unique opportunity to serve a broad cross section of the state's population. Enrollment declines in some urban campuses indicate that

not all systems are fully reaching this cross section. One explanation attributes this possible shortcoming of a few urban campuses to the failure to take full advantage of their natural strengths, striving instead to emulate flagship campuses.

47. The section on statistical analyses clearly shows the different attitudes of respondents about the desired degree of centralization for several administrative areas. Each multicampus system should study these areas carefully within its mission and restraints. These are the administrative areas in which the system often achieves less than its potential, or suffers unnecessary friction between the campuses and central office.

48. The multicampus system inherently places some restraints on its campuses through internal structures and management procedures but it also protects the campus against external pressures which cannot be avoided by independent campuses.

49. If the coordinating agency is objective, and not a rubber stamp of the state's political leadership, this observer feels that it is a partner of the multicampus system. For more populous states, systems of three levels coordinated by a flexible coordinating agency appears best. The three tiers would be: (a) community colleges, (b) four-year institutions including those with limited masters work and (c) research and extension level universities (university centers).

50. External critics have sometimes convinced educators that the cost of programs increases directly with the number and level of degrees offered. The cost of a degree program is often an incremental one and institutions should produce data reflecting the cost of each degree program

from the component courses. The most fruitful means by which multicampus institutions can reduce cost without loss of quality is by reducing the course inventory of those courses contributing to only one or two programs that do not attract a near capacity enrollment. Diminishing overlapping nonacademic and administrative work assignments also can produce important cost savings.

51. In Chapter 12, it is reported that campuses desire more autonomy in twenty-three administrative areas that are shared between the campuses and central staff. If the campuses were given the opportunity for more authority with no addition in personnel would they then desire the responsibility? If so the central staff could be reduced.

52. Systems vary widely and are influenced differently by state restraints, yet the preferred degree of centralization in the twenty-four areas considered are reasonably close among categories of respondents. This speaks to the acceptance of the concept of shared responsibility between the system and campus interests. The fact that the mean degree of centralization floats reasonably near the 2.5 to 3.0 value seems to document the concept that the campus and central administration are indeed partners.

53. Private institutions near a campus of a system can be affected positively or negatively by the campus depending on the initiative of the public campus to involve the private institution in its planning. If the campus of the system fails to do this, the private school will suffer losses, but the private school most often has friends in the region served. Hopefully these friends can also be supporters of the system, but a failure to plan with the private school can move its friends toward adversity to the system.

54. A multicampus administrative structure must insure a strong voice for campus executives. Every effort should be made to guarantee a reasonable balance of influence among members of the executive cabinet. Six central staff executives are proposed as a minimum with each primarily responsible for an important function of the central office. A cabinet consisting of some six central officers but only three or four campus executives deflates the influence of the campus elements. Although good leadership has enabled the University of Illinois to operate successfully as a system of three campuses, a minimum of four and preferably five campuses is necessary to provide a structure for a good interaction between campus executives and central staff executives. Large and diverse systems can maintain equitably balanced influence in the cabinet by limiting the size of delegations from both the central and campus offices. Central representatives, for example, should rarely number many more than the six proposed. In a system with many campuses, not every campus executive should expect to sit on the cabinet. At the State University of New York academic clusters elect campus executives to represent them in the cabinet. This appears to be a highly viable approach to governance in large and diverse systems.

55. A system with both commuter and residential campuses has a natural advantage in achieving diversity. Certain programs flourish in an urban environment and others benefit from a residential setting with fewer external distractions. Neither type of campus is isolated from its broad geographic environment but each provides comparative advantages for various programs.

Opportunities for noncredit academic programs and masters level degree work should be provided in populated areas in almost every field. The residential campus offers an advantage for many scientific and professional fields. This advantage derives from the academic demands of the programs and the length of uninterrupted periods of study required. The urban campuses have a natural advantage in many areas of the social sciences, humanities and the arts. Exceptions can be shown where outstanding achievements have been made contrary to the natural advantages of the examples cited, but these likely would have been even greater if buoyed by a favorable natural environment. Campus missions should clearly reflect the comparative advantages of each of these campus types.

56. Conclusions from the three measures described on page 215 for the twenty-four components of areas of shared administration between the central office and campus are subject to greater subjectivity than the other fifty-six points of this chapter. However, with the significant original data, numerous interviews and published opinions of experienced university faculty and administrators, a failure to include an opinion on the degree of centralization for these twenty-four areas would leave this report incomplete. Other observations from the survey are reported in Chapter 11. These are interesting to note and may serve as good seminar topics, however, they do not seem to meet the criteria of this chapter and further analysis is omitted.

The difference between a rank of 2 and 3, or 3 and 4, is especially significant as this moves respectively from campus predominance to equal responsibility and from equal responsibility to central predominance. The following assignment of relative degrees of centralization by this writer appears defensible on the basis of criteria defined for this chapter.

(See Chart on Next Page)

ITEM DESCRIPTION*	Scale Rank
1. Academic Extension	2
2. Assessment of Services	4
3. Accounting	3
4. Admissions	2
5. Alumni Relations	2
6. Athletics	2
7. Budget Allocation	4
8. Budget Control	3
9. Contract Administration	2
10. Federal Government Relations	2
11. Food Service	2
12. Fund Raising	2
13. Graduate School	2
14. Academic Programming	4
15. Faculty/Council Inputs	3
16. Personnel	2
17. Physical Plant	2
18. Planning	4
19. Priority for New Buildings	3
20. Public Service Extension	4
21. Public Information	2
22. Purchasing	3
23. Tenure and Promotion	2
24. Research Centers	3

57. The multicampus system has many advantages and when properly structured and managed, its superiority overshadows its inherent limitations. The multicampus system appears to offer even greater advantages to the campuses in periods of austerity than during times of expansion because of its flexibility, ability to plan, coordinating effectiveness and its inherent efficiency of resource utilization.

---

*See Appendix B for complete description of titles.

The multicampus or consolidated system must have an administrative structure that functions to accomplish the following: (a) protection of academic freedom and traditional faculty prerogative as academic overseers. (b) opportunity for faculty and student opinions to be considered prior to policy and important administrative decisions. (c) shared administration between the campus and central staffs. (d) cooperation with coordinating agencies. (e) cooperation with all elements of state government. (f) assessment of the educational, research and public service needs of the state. (g) assessment of the strengths, weakness and productivity of each academic units. (h) flexibility of the campuses to build on strengths as they strive to implement their missions. (i) coordination and shared programs to avoid replication. (j) decentralization of administration and operations to the maximum extent possible and by post audit the campuses are judged on their actions. (k) reallocation of resources to strengthen programs and start new ones of special academic value or of great importance to the state. (l) equitable allocation of resources among campuses. (m) protection of the institution against external pressures that are damaging to the campuses.

SECTION SUMMARY

Summary: These points are believed to integrate the most significant literature, the statistical treatment of the survey and interviews on the most pertinent items relating to the administrative structuring and functioning of multicampus universities. Structures have to be adaptable to meet the different state restraints, historical developments and the operational style of the board and system executive.

A case report for each central office and campus visit is included in the appendixes. These reports reflect the views of different respondents seen from their perspective. It is not expected that these always would be in agreement. These case studies have been used to build the report, but they have further potential value as resource material for seminars on the management of multicampus systems. To help see at a glance the organizational patterns of the systems included in this report, summary charts are included on pages 246 through 251.

This study clearly reveals that the administrative structure of the system is important to its success in achieving its inherent potentials. Hopefully the points of this section and the supporting material from priori sections will be of value not only to the University of Missouri, but other systems contemplating structure changes.

GOVERNING STRUCTURE	ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS 1	INSTITUTIONS	
		UNIV. OF ARKANSAS	UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
THE GOVERNING BOARD	FORM OF GOVERNANCE 2	DEVELOPING MULTICAMPUS	MULTICAMPUS
	NAME AND SIZE OF GOVERNING BOARD 3	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 10 MEMBERS APPOINTED BY GOVERNOR	BOARD OF REGENTS 16 MEMBERS AND 8 EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS
THE SYSTEM EXECUTIVE	TITLE OF SYSTEM EXECUTIVE 4	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT
	CAMPUS EXECUTIVES RESPONSIBLE TO... 5	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT
	SYSTEM EXECUTIVE CONTROLS HOW MANY CAMPUSES? 6	FIVE	NINE
SYSTEM BUDGETING PROCEDURES	RECIPIENT OF LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION 7	BOARD WITH LINE DESIGNATION TO CAMPUS AND UNITS	BOARD
	INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION FORMULA OR OTHER 8	DEPT. OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS FORMULA PRESENTATION TO LEGLIS. BY CAMPUS	FORMULA PLUS SPECIAL
OTHER STATE AGENCIES	NAME OF STATE WIDE COORDINATING AGENCY 9	DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION	Coordinating Commission For Higher Education
	ROLE OF STATE-WIDE AGENCY 10	BUDGET REQUESTS AND PROGRAM REGULATORY	ADVISORY, BUT HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL

1	UNIV. OF FLORIDA	UNIV. OF GEORGIA	UNIV. OF ILLINOIS	UNIV. OF KENTUCKY
2	CONSOLIDATED (STATE WIDE BOARD)	CONSOLIDATED (1 STATE-WIDE BOARD)	MULTICAMPUS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES
3	BOARD OF REGENTS 9 MEMBERS	BOARD OF REGENTS 15 MEMBERS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 9 POPULARLY ELECTED MEMBERS AND 2 EX-OFFICIO	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 18 MEMBER, (2 FACULTY 3 ALUMNI, 1 STUDENT; 12 APPOINTED BY GOVERNOR)
4	CHANCELLOR	CHANCELLOR	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
5	CHANCELLOR	CHANCELLOR	PRESIDENT	VICE PRESIDENT* FOR REGIONAL CAMPUSES
6	NINE	THIRTY	THREE	ONE UNIVERSITY AND NINE TWO YEAR REGIONAL CAMPUSES
7	BOARD	BOARD	BOARD	BOARD AND STATE COORDINATING AGENCY
8	FORMULA PLUS SPECIAL	FORMULA PLUS SPECIAL	LIMITED FORMULA PLUS SPECIAL	LINE TO BOARD, INCREMENT FROM COUNCIL
9	FLORIDA BOARD OF EDUCATION	NONE	ILL. BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION	KENTUCKY'S COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
10	RARELY EXERCISES ITS ENDOWED VETO POWER OVER THE CONSOLIDATED REGENTS	NONE	REGULATORY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAM	REGULATORY AND GOVERNMENTAL IN LIMITED AREAS

*The president is directly responsible for the main campus

1	LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIV. OF MARYLAND	UNIV. OF MISSOURI
2	MULTICAMPUS	MULTICAMPUS	MULTICAMPUS
3	BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 15 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 9 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF CURATORS 9 APPOINTED MEMBERS CONFIRMED BY SENATE
4	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT
5	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT
6	SIX	FOUR PLUS EXTENSION COLLEGE	FOUR
7	COORDINATING COUNCIL PROPOSES BUDGET BY CAMPUS FROM FORMULA. FUNDS RECEIVED FOR EACH CAMPUS PLUS OTHER SPECIAL LINES	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO BOARD AS LINE FOR CAMPUSES PLUS OTHER LINES	BOARD
8	DETERMINED BY APPROPRIATION LINES	OTHER	OTHER
9	LOUISIANA COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
10	REGULATORY FOR PROGRAM AND BUDGET REQUEST	REGULATOR FOR PROGRAMS, CAMPUS ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS	ADVISORY

1	UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH
2	CONSOLIDATED STATE-WIDE BOARD	BOARD OF TRUSTEES	BOARD OF TRUSTEES
3	BOARD OF GOVERNORS 32 MEMBERS ELECTED BY LEGISLATURE	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 32 MEMBERS APPOINTED BY GOV. EX-OFFICIO ALUMNI AND STATE ASSOCIATIONS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF 44 APPOINTED AND EX-OFFICIO
4	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT	CHANCELLOR
5	PRESIDENT	VICE PRESIDENT* FOR COMMONWEALTH CAMPUSES	ASSOCIATE PROVOST** FOR REGIONAL CAMPUSES
6	SIXTEEN	ONE UNIVERSITY TWENTY-ONE REGIONAL CAMPUSES	ONE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS AND FOUR REGIONAL CAMPUSES
7	BOARD WITH DESIGNATION FOR EACH CAMPUS PLUS INCREMENT TO SYSTEM	BOARD OF TRUSTEES	BOARD OF TRUSTEES
8	FORMULA AND OTHER	OTHER	OTHER
9	NONE	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
10	NONE	ADVISORY EXCEPT FOR NEW OR UPGRADED CAMPUSES	ADVISORY EXCEPT FOR NEW OR UPGRADED CAMPUSES

*The President is directly responsible for the main campus

**The Chancellor is directly responsible for the main campus

1	PURDUE UNIVERSITY	UNIV. OF TENNESSEE	UNIV. OF TEXAS
2	BOARD OF TRUSTEES	MULTICAMPUS	MULTICAMPUS
3	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 8 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 22 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF REGENTS 9 MEMBERS APPOINTED
4	PRESIDENT	PRESIDENT	CHANCELLOR
5	PROVOST FOR* REGIONAL CAMPUSES	PRESIDENT	CHANCELLOR
6	ONE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS AND FIVE REGIONAL CAMPUSES	FIVE	TWELVE
7	BOARD OF TRUSTEES	COORDINATING COUNCIL PROPOSES BUDGET BY CAMPUS FROM FORMULA FUNDS RECEIVED FOR EACH CAMPUS PLUS OTHER SPECIAL LINES	COORDINATING BOARD PROPOSES BUDGET BY CAMPUS FROM FORMULA. FUNDS RECEIVED FOR EACH CAMPUS PLUS SPECIAL LINES
8	OTHER	DETERMINED BY APPROPRIATION LINES	DETERMINED BY APPROPRIATION LINES
9	INDIANA HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION	TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
10	ADVISORY BUT OF GROWING INFLUENCE	REGULATORY FOR BUDGET PROPOSALS AND PROGRAMS	REGULATORY FOR BUDGET PROPOSALS AND PROGRAMS

*The president is directly responsible for the main campus

1	UNIV. OF WISCONSIN	STATE UNIV. OF NEW YORK	CITY UNIV. OF NEW YORK
2	CONSOLIDATED STATE WIDE BOARD	MULTICAMPUS	MULTICAMPUS
3	BOARD OF REGENTS 18 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES 15 APPOINTED MEMBERS	BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION 10 MEMBERS APPOINTED BY MAYOR AND GOV.
4	PRESIDENT	CHANCELLOR	CHANCELLOR
5	PRESIDENT	CHANCELLOR	CHANCELLOR
6	SIXTEEN PLUS EXTENSION AND TWO YEAR CENTERS	THIRTY-FOUR	TWENTY
7	BOARD OF REGENTS	BOARD OF TRUSTEES BUT DETAILED LINE ITEMS	BOARD OF HIGHER EDUC. BUT DETAILED LINE ITEMS
8	FORMULA AND OTHER	FORMULA AND OTHER	FORMULA AND OTHER
9	NONE	NEW YORK BOARD OF REGENTS	NEW YORK BOARD OF REGENTS
10	NONE	REGULATORY ON PROGRAM, CAMPUS DELETIONS OR ADDITIONS	REGULATORY ON PROGRAM, CAMPUS DELETIONS OR ADDITIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baker, Merl W., Duke University Student Task Force on the Financing of Higher Education, 1974
2. Baldridge, Victor J., Academic Governance, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1971.
3. Berdahl, Robert O., Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1971.
4. Bowen, Frank M., and Lee, Eugene C., The Multicampus University, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
5. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Capitol and the Campus, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
6. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
7. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective Uses of Resources, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
8. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Priorities For Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
9. Epstein, Leon, Governing the University, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
10. Millett, John D., Resource Reallocation in Research Universities, Washington, D. C., Academy for Educational Development, In., 1973.
11. Perry, Richard E. and Hull W. Frank, IV, The Organized Organization: The American University and its Administration, The University of Toledo, 1971.
12. The Report to the President of the University of Missouri from the Task Force on State-Level Coordination and Governance of Higher Education, Jully 11, 1972.

APPENDIXES

University of Missouri
COLUMBIA · KANSAS CITY · ROLLA · ST. LOUIS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

321 University Hall
Columbia, Mo. 65201

Telephone
314-882-2011

President Ratchford has asked that I make an in-depth study of some administrative functions of selected multi-campus universities. The results will assist him and the Board of Curators to evaluate the University of Missouri administrative structure. Your assistance is urgently needed to complete this assignment.

From experience we know that your schedule is greatly overburdened, but we also know the satisfaction of being able to occassionally help a colleague. We, therefore, earnestly solicit your response to the attached survey which can be completed in a few minutes.

To enhance, and perhaps expand, the study, I hope to make an appointment for a personal interview or a telephone conversation with you in early 1974. In a few cases, the survey is being sent directly to persons identified as representative of the categories needed in Item III. However, we would like very much to ask you to forward to persons you select to represent Item III the extra copies enclosed. This will help to obtain the broad cross section indicated in Item III. May I have the completed survey returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope by December 20, 1973.

Your help in this project will be greatly appreciated!

Sincerely yours,

Merl Baker
Special Assistant to the President

MB:sh

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION SURVEY*

GUIDELINES FOR SURVEY:

1. Replies requested by December 20 if possible
2. Confidential treatment of all replies assured
3. Summary of responses will be shared with all participants requesting the information by checking item VI
4. Addressed envelope with pre-paid postage enclosed
5. Please check appropriate answers or add choices if necessary

SURVEY QUESTIONS

I. Type of institution

1. Grants PhD ____yes ____no
2. Governed by
   - A. ____ one board and one administrative head for the state
   - B. ____ one board and one administrative head for a university system but not including all institutions in the state
   - C. ____ one board but separate administrative heads for each institution in the state
   - D. ____ one board and one administrative head for a single institution
   - E. ____ other -- please state ______________________________

II. Your role is with ____central administration ____one campus

III. Your major responsibility is as

1. ___ Chief administrative officer (____President ____Chancellor)
2. ___ Vice President for ____________________
3. ___ Vice Chancellor for ____________________
4. ___ Provost
5. ___ Dean of ____________________
6. ___ Department Chairman of ____________________
7. ___ Professor of ____________________
8. ___ Elected officer of alumni association
9. ___ University board member
10. ___ Other -- please state ____________________

IV. Number of students in your field of responsibility

1. ____ Above 20,000
2. ____ 15,000 to 19,999
3. ____ 10,000 to 14,999
4. ____ Below 10,000

*by Dr. Merl Baker, Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Rolla from 1964 until 11/18/73 when the opportunity arose to serve all four campuses of the University of Missouri. This study of selective multi-campus universities is being made at the request of President Brice Ratchford in an endeavor to help evaluate the Missouri structure. Your responses will be of invaluable assistance and are urgently requested.

V. Utilize these guidelines for circling the scales below:

1. Complete responsibility of the individual campuses
2. Responsibility of each campus with central administration having limited responsibility
3. Nearly equally shared responsibility between the campuses and central administration
4. Responsibility of central administration with individual campuses having limited responsibility
5. Complete responsibility of central administration

Scale A--indicates where you think the responsibility currently lies

Scale B--indicates where you think the responsibility should be

Scale C--write title of officer presently primarily responsible

Please omit any functions of which you have no direct knowledge.

1. Academic extension (credit courses, short courses and conferences)

A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5

B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5

C. Title responsible now ______________________

2. Assessment of services to state (agriculture, business, industry and labor)

A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5

B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5

C. Title responsible now ______________________

3. Accounting

A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5

B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5

C. Title responsible now ______________________

4. Admissions

A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5

B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5

C. Title responsible now ______________________

5. Alumni relations

A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5

B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5

C. Title responsible now ______________________

6. Athletics
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

7. Budgetary allocation
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

8. Budgetary control
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

9. Contract administration
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

10. Federal Government relations
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

11. Food Services
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

12. Fund raising (development)
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

13. Graduate school administration
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

14. New academic programs
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

15. Opportunities for faculty committees and councils to have inputs on administrative levels
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

16. Personnel (non-academic)
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

17. Physical plant
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

18. Planning
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

19. Priority for new buildings
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

20. Public service extension, but with little academic relation
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

21. Public information
    A. (AS IS) 1 2 3 4 5
    B. (PREFER) 1 2 3 4 5
    C. Title responsible now ______________________________

22. Purchasing

A. (AS IS) 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5

B. (PREFER) 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5

C. Title responsible now ________________

23. Tenure and promotion

A. (AS IS) 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5

B. (PREFER) 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5

C. Title responsible now ________________

24. Research centers or institutes

A. (AS IS) ________________

B. (PREFER) ________________

C. Title responsible now ________________

If you have any comments or questions about this survey, please state them on the back of this page and I will certainly attempt to provide answers.

If you don't mind adding your name and address below it would be helpful, especially if additional studies are made, but this is not at all necessary.

Name with title ________________

University address ________________

____

____

University phone number(s) area code (___) - ________

VI. Interested in receiving summary of this survey? ____Yes ____No

(Please don't feel obligated to request this, but if administrative functions and changes are being considered, I will be more than glad to share this information with you. Hopefully, this part of the study will be finished by April.

If you wish to receive this summary, but chose not to add your name on the proceeding page, please add it here and mail this portion of the survey separately.)

Name with title____________________________

University address__________________________

____

____

University phone number(s) area code (___) - ________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR WILLINGNESS TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!!!

Appendixes C, D, E, F and G are bound under a separate cover